



THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC

QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the QUARTERLY will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutatory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXXVI.-JULY, 1911-No. 143.

THE EARLY CHURCH AND COMMUNISM.

HE Acts of the Apostles when intelligently examined, give no countenance to the interpretation of them in the sense that Communism was the general and the practically enforced teaching of the Apostles. Such community of goods as existed was evidently optional and limited in area, though almsgiving for the needy was universally expected.

There are, however, some isolated passages from early fathers, which are much exploited by communists, with great show of conclusiveness in the eyes of those who see no further than the words specially garbled for a purpose. From out the stump orator's stockin-trade we may select the following as among his most plausible specimens. Those two interdependent documents, the Didache and the Epistle of Barnabas, have almost identically the words: "You shall hold all things in common with your brethren and shall not call things your own; for being sharers in a common immortality, how much more should you be sharers in things perishable." (Didache 4, Ep. Barnab. 19.) Clement of Rome is often added to the above two witnesses, more or less contemporary; but the words culled are really from the pseudo-Clementines of a later date and are not made authoritative by the fact that they were inserted in Gratian's Decretals (cap. 2, Dilectissimis, p. ii., causa xii., quæst. i.), which was not a critically formed collection. The doctrine there found is that per iniquitatem1 individuals took out of the common possessions certain portions and called them their own. What is

¹ Clem. Recog., Lib. x., n. 5. Cf. Hom., xv., 7.

386

lacking in authority to this document is supposed to be supplied by similar declarations on the part of St. Ambrose, who certainly is rhetorical and hyperbolical in some of his phrases. In his sermon on Naboth's vineyard he speaks of the earth as made for all men, who are all born naked into the world; thus nature produces no children rich by their nativity; she is the equal mother of every one. Here is a truth, but it is isolated by communists from other truths which St. Ambrose recognized in other places concerning right of property and wrongness of theft. One passage, however, he has which opposes the doctrine of recent theologians, who say that when the rich man neglects a clear obligation to give alms he sins, but against charity, not against justice; for the money withheld by him has never been made the property of the destitute claimant, and so has not been stolen from him, and does come afterwards under the law of restitution. The Bishop of Milan, on the contrary, writes: "It is not out of your own belongings that you relieve the indigent; you restore to him what was his. What was given in common for the use of all you wrongfully turn to your own exclusive use." (Quod commune est in omnium usum datum, tu solus usurbas.) Here we do better to leave alone usurbas, since it has not in Latin a necessarily bad sense; but we must examine more minutely the kindred word usus.

Moralists distinguish ownership of a property from the use of it; the two are separable and are often separated in practice. Aristotle, who attacked the communism of Plato-which was put forth explicitly for a limited class of citizens, and these the highest in position—argues that ownership in private is needful, but that its evil is to be counteracted by a generous allowance of the use for the benefit of those who are in want. The like doctrine may be gathered from St. Paul, when he instructed St. Timothy to preach so much of communism in actual use of private property as to tell the rich to be free in communicating (koinonikoi) from their abundant means relief to the destitute (I. Tim. vi., 18). The Apostle never shows himself much versed in Greek literature, but he might have read-or might not, for Christ was sufficient Master-the fifth chapter in Book II. of Aristotle's Politics, where we find: "Plainly it is desirable that the tenure of property shall be private; yet the practical use of it should be for the common benefit." There should be no extravagant possession (pleonexia) and no destitution. St. Thomas holds a similar doctrine; both writers have been accused of great reserve in their defense of private property and have made no case out for the millionaire such as the gigantic enterprises of modern commerce render possible without what we deem fraud-though fraud is often present. St. Thomas condemns

all avarice in quest of the wrongful pleonexia (2^{da}, 2^{dae}, Q. 118, A. 1), and in another place, while he upholds a reasonable possession of riches on condition that the use of them be with due charity to the poor: "As to their use man ought not to regard external goods as simply his own, but he should be easily moved to employ them for the common good." (Q. 66, A. 2.) And in reply to the first objection raised on the point he says: "Community of goods is referable to the law of nature, not because this law enjoins the common possession of everything to the exclusion of private property, but because the division of property is something supervening upon nature and belongs to the positive law of human institution." The like is taught also in 1^a, 2^{dae}, Q. 94, A. 5, ad. 3. It is not needful here to suppose that St. Thomas means by the law of nature anything wider than human nature; positive facts always enter into the determination.²

Let us now return to St. Ambrose and consider how he, a busy magistrate, suddenly transferred in ripe age, at the call of the popular voice, from the secular administration to be a Bishop in an important centre during critical times, had not the leisure, as St. Thomas had, to study the analysis of property into the elements of ownership and use. If the analysis had been presented to him, he might have worded his doctrine with more precision. But, furthermore, an analysis other than the one approved in our recognized text books of moral theology is worth notice and is more consonant with the words of St. Ambrose. By at least an implied consent of the community for the common good, certain individuals appropriate certain things out of the common stock. Now suppose the appropriation to be not absolute, but limited by future claims of charity. Then so much property belongs to A till in a future emergency a portion of it will pass to B as his by right of necessity. This theory, as far as we know, has to-day no declared supporters among our theologians; but some way for it has been prepared by certain words of St. Thomas when he refers the division of property among individuals not simply to nature, but to a foundation only in nature upon which men build up forms of agreement by quasi contract. Evidently it is possible for us, in the absence of actually formulated terms, to vary our conception of the contract about which St. Thomas speaks.

He says, 1a, 2dae, Q. 94, A. 5, ad. 3: Aliquid dicitur secundo modo esse de jure naturæ, quia natura non inducit contrarium, et hoc modo communis omnium possessio dicitur esse de jure naturali; quia scilicet divisio possessionum per hominum rationem ad utilitatem humanæ vitæ introducta est—or, as he says elsewhere, secundum

² Lugo, De Justit et jur., Disp. VI., Sec. 1.

humanum condictum (2da, 2dae, Q. 66, A. 2, ad. 1). And in his reply, ad. 3, he deals precisely with the words of St. Ambrose: "As to what St. Ambrose says, namely: Let no one call his own what is common; he is speaking of property in regard to use." This distinction of use from ownership was the first and best account which we have here rendered of what the Milanese Doctor has written; the second account we have offered only as a speculation, not as the solution to be adopted.3 We may compare the case indirectly with what is taught about the Immaculate Conception. Some are not content to hold simply that Mary, after being generally included in the sentence, was specially taken away from the effect of the decree that on Adam's sin a taint should follow for all descendants of the offending progenitor; they maintain that she was exempted not only from the actual incidence of the penalty, but even from the actual sentence itself, so that her redemption through Christ's merits took place in the form: "This decree from the first shall not anclude the Mother of God, because her Son prevents it." The partial likeness here to the appropriations out of the common stock of goods lies only in the matter of agreements being more or less radical. The less radical says that ownership is absolute, but limited in use by demands of charity; the more radical asserts that when those demands arise the charitable contribution is simply and ipso facto the property of the needy person by the implied terms of the original division, secundum humanum condictum. This is ideal construction, not actual transaction in the past history of society. The second supposition would best fit the words of St. Ambrose: Non de tuo largiris pauperi, sed de suo reddis.

Keeping to his conception, St. Ambrose uses the phrase again in his Explanation of Psalm cxviii., n. 22, on which he thus comments: "God wished the earth to be common property of all men and to bring forth its fruits for all, but avarice has made a distribution of right to property." Undoubtedly avarice has so offended beyond what we may style the equitable distribution: no one can defend the whole existent facts of the distribution, and Aristotle and St. Thomas seem to offer no explicit justification for any fortune that is enormous (pleonexia). Commerce was then a comparatively small affair. We may be sure, at any rate, that St. Ambrose, with all his

³ We should remember that moral distinctions have not mathematical rigor. St. Gregory I. takes the view of St. Ambrose: "Cunctis terra communis est, et alimenta omnibus comuniter profert. Cum quaelibet necessaria indigentibus ministramus, sua illis reddimus non nostra largimus. justitiae debitum potius solvemus quam misericordiae operae implemus" (Lib. Reg. Past, Part III., 21.) A man in extreme hunger, if no other means is available, may without theft take food even against the wrongful unwillingness of the possessor, who therefore does not give it.

practical knowledge of the world and by acquiescence with its well-accredited usage among the aristocracy of which he was a member, allowed for a legitimate possession of riches by a whole class of men. It was in acceptance of such a situation that he wrote in this style: "The sentence of condemnation by heaven is out, not against those who simply hold riches, but against those who do not know how to employ them." In Luc. Lib. v., n. 69.)4

It would be too long to examine difficulties adduced from the Greek Fathers, St. Basil (Migne tom. 31, col. 276 sqq., col. 309 sqq.) and St. Chrysostom (tom. 62, col. 564 sqq.),5 but we may here add to the citations from St. Ambrose a proverb which St. Jerome has in some way made his own, and which is often cited: "That common saying seems very true: The rich man is either a thief (iniquus) or the heir of a thief." (Ep. 120, c. 1.) This is found in a comment on the text, "Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of iniquity;" and the proverb has just that quantity of truth in it which suffices for a proverb, but not for a rigorously accurate utterance. St. Jerome, who denounced women, does not wholly vilify the sex; it was even made a charge against him that he did so cultivate the friendship of some female devotees who are now known as saints; and similarly his general denunciation of the rich left him quite reconciled to the rich who made good use of their riches. In due season he can and does speak of legitimate wealth. It would be as absurd to tie him down to a single proverb as it would be to measure St. Augustine by his characteristically exuberant utterance which is not simply his own: "Search out what things are really necessary and you will see how few they are; superfluities beyond your necessity are the necessities of other people. To possess superfluities is to possess what belongs to others." (In Psal. cxlvii., 12. Migne tom. 37, col. 1922.)

Furthermore, while insisting upon alms-deeds the early writers were very careful not to encourage idle vagrants, who should simply on the score of having nothing put in a claim for a share of the common possession. The Fathers upheld the obligation to found a claim to the means of subsistence by the title of work. St. Paul had led the way in the well-known utterance, which may be and has been too hardly pressed: "He that will not work, neither let

⁴ Similar difficulties to the above occur in what St. Ambrose has written, De Officis Ministrorum, Lib. I., q. 28, n. 132, where he repeats the phrase, "Natura jus commune generavit, usurpatio fecit jus privatum."

⁵ We have no proof that St. Basil himself is responsible for the words of Rufinus, his translator, who was accustomed to take liberties with the text: "Terra communiter omnibus hominibus data est; proprium nemo dicat; quod e communi plus quam sufficeret sumptum est, violenter obtentum est" (Tom. 31, col. 1,752).

him eat." (2 Thess. iii., 10.) At the same time effort was made to find work for the unemployed—employment even for clerics, provided it was suitable to their special calling. Their office might be humble, but not degrading. In the so-called second Epistle of St. Clement to the Corinthians (n. 8) the general law is: "Give work to those able to labor, but for those unable make charitable provision."6 And against ministers of the Gospel in particular, that they might not make a distracting traffic of their employment, it was enacted that foreign trade should be forbidden to them, while an itinerant prophet could not impose himself on a congregation for more than two or three days. Many sources of money earning were shut out from Christians because of their connection in some way or other with the recognition of idolatrous practices. Hence Tertullian had as best he could on his own rigorous principles to reply to the charge that Christians were infructuosi in negotiisa race of non-productives. (Apol. n. 42.)

A fuller proof that all private property was not condemned lies in the very obvious facts that the Church tolerated and even welcomed to its bosom the legitimately well-to-do classes, as is shown in the converts received. Various writers have sufficiently gathered the evidences that while early Christians were mainly the poor, they always had some rich in their body, and these increased in numbers as the religion spread. It would have been against the universality of Christ's mission had he excluded from His Church any rank whose position was not intrinsically wrong in itself. Christ proved Himself willing to receive among His disciples centurions in the specially difficult position of the army; He made use of the resources of such men as Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea, who held prominent positions. The Acts of the Apostles and their epistles show that the Church enjoyed the assistance of certain rich or well-stationed men and women. If we leave as doubtful the rank of Pope St. Clement we find two of the Flavii to be Christians, Titus Clemens and his wife Domitilla. The lady Pomponia Græcina was probably a convert. The gens Annoea, the Pomponii and the Acilii had Christian members in their families. That the Christians were of all ranks is explicitly asserted not only by Tertullian (omnis dignitatis, Ad. Nat. i., 1) and Origen, but also by the Roman Governor Pliny in his letter to Trajan (multi omnis ordinis). It is quite a strong point in the exhortations of the times that Christians possessed of wealth should use it in the spirit of their religion and not consort with the pagans of their own rank in the pursuit of excessive pleasures—that "they shall not hold intercourse with heathens on the plea that such a life was sweetest to their taste."

⁶ So also in the Didache, n. 12.

(Hermas Sim. viii., 9.) The oft-quoted treatise by Clement of Alexandria on the Salvation of the Rich has special regard to such Christians. From the time mentioned by the Acts (xiii., I,) when "Manahen, who had been brought up with Herod the tetrarch" was a Christian and by St. Paul in his reference to the Christians "of Cæsar's household" (Philip. iv., 22) up to the age of Diocletian, who made the many Christians at his court a special object of persecution, imitating therein what Valerian had done before him, there had been, with interruptions, a constant increase of the faithful who held positions round the royal person. The above instances are a few items out of many which have been extracted to show that a poor station was not the only one compatible with Christian doctrine and that the main commandment on the point was that embodied in the words of Psalm lxi., 11: "If you are in affluence fix not your heart on riches." That such is the fact is gathered not from the inconclusive references to a few isolated sentences. but by the normal attitude of the Church to the existence of riches among her members. The condition as such was never condemned, and therefore communist theories on the subject will not stand examination. They belong to the category of clap-trap very manifestly, while, on the other hand, it is equally manifest that many of the facts of our age in the relation of rich to poor are strongly reprobated by the Gospel. But we shall never mend matters and make the interrelations of men satisfactory by mechanically devised schemes for the equal distribution of goods. Even a pagan philosopher saw the fact which early Christianity viewed in a still higher light of the Beatitudes. He appealed only to natural reason. "It is in the strength of the hold on the subjective side of law and institutions that Aristotle reaches some of his greatest conclusions. He can answer Plato's communism with the rejoinder that it is a cleansing of the heart and not of the garments that the world requires. Communistic institutions will not create unselfishness, but a mind trained to unselfishness by education will treat even private property in the spirit of communism."7 It was the agreement of Aristotle with St. Thomas to recommend private tenure with use for the community—possession for the individual with benefit for all. The exact proportion between property to be possessed individually and property to be possessed communally the Church does not pretend to determine; it will vary with the changes of social organization.

JOHN RICKABY, S. J.

Stonyhurst, England.

^{7 &}quot;The Political Thought of Plato and Aristotle," by E. Barker, M. A., p. 324.

ST. ELIZABETH VON SCHONAU AND HER VISIONS.

A BOUT twenty-five years ago there was published in Germany an exhaustive treatise by F. W. E. Roth on this celebrated German mystic, Elizabeth of Schönau, which includes an edition of her visions and letters and the writings of her brother Eckbert, abbot of Schönau. It is from this source, mainly, unless otherwise stated, that this sketch of her is derived. Although she was not a canonized saint of the Church, Elizabeth's name is mentioned in the Roman Martyrology, and in the calendar of the saints of the Cistercian Order she is honored on June 18, which has perhaps led to the mistake of calling her a Cistercian nun, whereas she was a Benedictine. In the Benedictine Menology, published in 1650, she is spoken of as "St. Elizabeth of Schönau, celebrated for her observance of monastic life, virgin and abbot of Schönau." Also in the Benedictine Annals of 1656 she is mentioned as "our prophetess, the admirable St. Elizabeth of Schönau."

Bucelinus calls her "that jewel of Germany, St. Elizabeth of Schönau, recommended for her great merits, who foretold with incredible fruit by her prophetic spirit what was about to happen in this world." Peter Canisius says of her in the Martyrologium, "the virgin Elizabeth of Schönau, of blessed memory, to whom divine secrets have been revealed, who wrote a splendid book of divine and holy admonitions."

An English Cistercian monk named Roger, of the Abbey of Ford, on the River Exe, in Devonshire, who was very pious and learned, while traveling in Germany with the leave of his abbot, was so excited by the fame of her holiness that he visited Schönau and received all her revelations from William, then abbot of Schönau. These he afterwards collated in two books, with the title "The Revelations of St. Elizabeth of Schönau." Her name is found in most biographical dictionaries and mediæval chronicles, for her fame was widely spread, though she is not so well known as her great contemporary, another visionary, St. Hildegarde, abbess of St. Rupert. Elizabeth was born in 1129, in the Middle Rhine province. Her family name, according to Zedler, was Hartwig, but little is certainly known of her home and parentage. She had two brothers, Eckbert, abbot of Schönau, and another, who was provost of Polden, and several sisters, one of whom married and came from a distance to attend Elizabeth's funeral. Bonn is believed to have been her birthplace, but all that is certain is that

¹ Die Visionen der heilage Elizabeth von Schönau," von F. W. E. Roth, 1884, Brunn.

it was some town in the Middle Rhine province. She was a delicate child, sickly by nature, and when she was twelve years old she was sent to the Benedictine Abbey of Schönau to be educated.

The monastery of Schönau was founded about the year 1124, but the exact date is uncertain, as also are the names of the founders, who are believed to have been Count Rupert of Nuremberg and Hildelin, the first abbot, who was of noble birth. The patron saint of Schönau was St. Florin, who lived at Coblentz in the beginning of the seventh century,² and to him the monastery was dedicated and called after his name. The district in which the site was situated was rude and uncultivated, and the building of the new monastery proceeded slowly, but Hildelin appealed to the Archbishop of Trêves to help them, and he gave them the church of Welterode, which stood near the new building, and gave the priest of Welterode another church. This was in 1145, a few years after Elizabeth was sent to school there. The nuns' convent was built close to the monastery, and was dependent upon it and was under the superintendence of the monks; it was governed by a prior and a mistress or prioress. The convent always remained small, and is spoken of as a cell in old documents, but it attained great notoriety through Elizabeth, the visionary and saint. The discipline was strict. The nuns' convent suffered many losses from the plague in 1503, and later it was injured in the Reformation, and in 1500 it fell. The rest of the monastery remained standing till 1606, when the Nassau government broke up the buildings.

Elizabeth was educated in the convent, and when she reached the age of eighteen she took the habit in 1147, and ten years later was elected abbess, or, as she called herself, mistress of the nuns. Since only women of noble birth were promoted to spiritual offices in the Benedictine Order in the twelfth century, and indeed the subjects themselves were mostly of noble birth, it seems most probable that Elizabeth sprung from the nobility. When she was twenty-three her visions began, and from that time till her early death, in 1164, she seems to have been always more or less in a suffering condition. When she reached her thirty-sixth year signs of her approaching end showed themselves, but the illness was a lingering one, and Elizabeth employed the time in exhorting the monks and nuns and the strangers who visited her. Her death was that of a saint, and took place on June 18, 1164. Her end was no doubt hastened by her austerities, especially by her wonderful abstinence from food and drink, which seems to have been almost miraculous. On her deathbed she asked pardon of the

^{2 &}quot;Histoire Ecclésiastique," par M. Fleury, Vol. XV., pp. 28-29.

monks and nuns who were gathered round her for any wrong she might have done them, and addressed warning words to her superior, Abbot Hildelin, and admonished the monks to say their office and her brother Eckbert to remain in the cloister. He was a canon of Bonn Cathedral when his sister sent for him to come to Schönau and take the habit there. She directed that one of her relations should succeed her as abbess, and then passed away.

The Abbot Hildelin was a very old man when Elizabeth died, and on his death he was succeeded by Elizabeth's brother, Eckbert, who remained true to the exhortations she had given him when dying, not to leave Schönau, although several higher appointments were offered him, for he was a learned man, very pious and much respected. The outward events of Elizabeth's life were very few. Her clothing, her profession, her subsequent election as abbess, the arrival of her brother Eckbert at Schönau at her request and her visit or, it may have been, visits to her contemporary, St. Hildegarde, and to Cologne and Mainz were the principal incidents in her career, if we except her illnesses and the ecstasies, trances, visions and raptures to which she was subject. She had a large correspondence with various abbots, abbesses, monks and nuns and with the principal people in Mainz and Trêves, but her correspondents were less celebrated than those of St. Hildegarde, who wrote to Popes and emperors and kings. In these letters Elizabeth expresses her grief at the wickedness of the age, and points out what she conceives to be the remedy for it; but, as we shall see, there is a great similarity in these epistles, in which she acts as a monitress to the clergy and laity. Elizabeth lived in the time of the Papal schism which arose on the death of the English Pope, Adrian IV., in 1159, when Frederick Barbarossa's party set up the antipope Victor IV. in opposition to Alexander III., elected by the Roman Cardinals. Unfortunately for her, Elizabeth adhered to the schismatic Victor, which was no doubt the cause of her unpopularity among the clergy and of the persecution she endured at the hands of some of them. It was her brother Eckbert's influence which induced her to support the schismatic Pope, and he was led away by political and patriotic reasons and his loyalty to his emperor, and it is probable that Elizabeth, living the retired, contemplative life she did, cared nothing for politics and simply accepted Eckbert's opinion as to which was the true Pope. This fact gave the clergy some excuse, if not some reason, for the attacks they made upon her and for the mockery some of them made of her gift of second sight. Perhaps to it must be ascribed the calumny she suffered by false letters being written and spread in her name and the unjust accusation that she had written concerning the last judgment. She defended herself against these charges in a long letter to St. Hildegarde.

After her visit to St. Hildegarde at the Monastery of Mount St. Rupert, in 1156, the year before she was elected abbess, she began to write her celebrated little treatise, the "Liber Viarum Dei," apparently modeled on the "Scivias" of St. Hildegarde, who was a great inspirer of Elizabeth's writings. One of the marks of the genuineness of Elizabeth's visions is that her development was gradual. Herr Roth divides her life into three periods, the first of which was prefaced by diabolical visions, in which she suffered temptations which she resisted successfully by prayer. To these succeeded the appearance of the angel through whose means she always received her revelations and of certain saints, which appearances continued for a year. During them she held converse with the angel and the saints over heavenly things, mainly on the interpretation of Holy Scripture. This was the first period of Elizabeth's work when her soul's life was the contemplation of higher things. In her second period, in which she wrote the "Liber Viarum Dei," she became a teacher of the people, working outwardly, uttering all kinds of warnings beautifully and sublimely. In her third period she appears as a pointer out of the relics of the new-found saints of Cologne. Her gifts of second sight, according to Roth, now stood at its highest, and she used it to spread the cultus of these new-found saints.

As it was Elizabeth's revelations on these Cologne relics which are the most open to suspicion of all her writings and visions, it may be as well to say a few words about them. It seems that in 1156 several tombs were discovered at Cologne,³ with inscriptions saying they were the tombs of St. Ursula and her companion saints, and that they had been honored there for over three hundred years. The names of several Bishops and holy people who were reported to have accompanied Ursula were also mentioned. Gerlac, abbot of Duits, sent the principal and most remarkable of these inscriptions to Elizabeth of Schönau, hoping she would have some revelation concerning them and be able to assure him whether to honor them or not, some suspicion having arisen that the people who found the bodies had forged the inscriptions.

The revelation concerning St. Ursula and the eleven thousand virgins by Elizabeth has been condemned by Pope Gregory VIII., and it seems a pity she yielded to the pressure put upon her by some of her confidants and wrote it against her own wish, for she refused at first to do so. The probability is that, if the inscriptions

³ "Histoire Ecclésiastique," par M. Fleury, Prêtre Prieur d'Argentine, Paris, 1724, Vol. XV., pp. 28-29.

had never been sent to her for her opinion, she would never have had any vision concerning them. In the lowest degree of her visions she saw objects only with the eyes of her spirit, but in the highest degree with the eyes of her body and spirit together. At these times she fell into an ecstasy, in which her body was deprived of all feeling, and her fall to the ground was unperceived by her; her body was stiff, her will could not struggle to raise it, she had to be lifted by others. These ecstasies especially occurred when she had been fasting very rigorously. Though insensible to exterior pain, she nevertheless perceived pains inflicted by the angel who appeared to her during one vision and felt these pains for several days afterwards.

Herr Roth endeavors to describe the origin and nature of the visions of Elizabeth in a natural manner, and since the present writer desires to express no opinion on such high matters as the truth or falsehood of these visions and revelations, it will be as well to quote verbatim the learned German's psychological disquisition on the same, leaving our readers to judge for themselves where his theology is at fault.

He says "that Elizabeth possessed by nature the disposition to ecstasy, which later developed to a magnetic clairvoyance. She was cut off from the world, thrown upon the resources of her inner soul's life and compelled by the strictness of the rule of her order to busy herself only with prayer and contemplation, and that in the spirit of the Benedictines. To sink her soul in the mysteries of religion became to her a second nature, which developed into a fanatical devotion, reaching to ecstatic clairvoyance and raptures. Elizabeth generally had these ecstasies after her visions at the time of divine service, when her devotion was kindled and her powers of contemplation raised. Then she saw her thoughts embodied, she saw supernatural things, she had speech with the angels of God, with Mary, with the saints; even Christ Himself appeared to her in spirit. On feast days it was generally those saints whose feasts had begun who appeared to her. Through the continual reading of Holy Scripture, especially the Apocalypse and the Psalms, she mixed these appearances with the texts of Holy Scripture and supported the visions with the latter. She explained difficult parts of the text after she had had a pretended (sic) vision on it and had had speech with the saints."

From this quotation it will be seen that Herr Roth, though a great admirer of Elizabeth, is no believer in her visions as divine revelations; in fact, he says plainly in another place that "her visions have a very earthly character, in no way that of the revelation of God, and that, just like a weak woman, she had confidence

in her visions and praised them as divine inspirations." He also says that "she frequently in her visions comes into conflict with the words of Holy Scripture," but he adds that though "she often sees the opposite of what Holy Scripture says, more often are her visions in correspondence with the words of Holy Writ."

She always she tells us received her revelations through an angel or a saint, whose utterance she valued as the Word of God; but, on the other hand, she sometimes mistrusted their statements and wanted things explained again. On her deathbed she acknowledged her revelations as divine, and in a letter to St. Hildegarde she denounces all doubters.

The saints with whom Elizabeth had communion in her visions were especially those honored in the Order of St. Benedict and who possessed a special cultus in Schönau, which was extended through her influence.

Again Herr Roth says that "Elizabeth's visions have a distinctly womanly character; the inner life of the soul that speaks in them, the fantastic dreams, the half-dreams during the day, the ecstasy, the melancholy pains, the hysterical raptures as such are all womanly. The womanly curiosity about all she hears and sees, often so naive, must also be considered. All this protects the visions (whose simple statements are too absolutely true to be the work of a man) from all attacks of ingenuineness."

In this last remark the German author is alluding to the fact that all Elizabeth's visions and revelations were written by her brother Eckbert, who came at her request from Bonn to record them. It seems that after a vision Elizabeth either wrote down herself what she had seen and heard on one of the wax tablets in use in the twelfth century or got some of the nuns in her confidence to do so for her, and that when Eckbert came from Bonn, he used these records and put them into better Latin when written in Latin, or translated them into it when written in German. Others he wrote down which were related to him from memory by the saint. She testifies herself that her visions were all written down during her lifetime, and the book in which they were written was hidden in her bed and given to the abbot at her death.

Herr Roth does not believe that Eckbert added anything to his sister's records, for he had too great a reverence for her to do so. All he did was to correct the grammar and put them into better Latin, for he was a scholar himself and for his age a learned man.

Another question is, was Elizabeth illiterate, and was, as the monks and nuns of Schönau believed, all her learning infused? Herr Roth thinks not. She would certainly, he thinks, have learned sufficient Latin to understand the Psalms and Holy Scripture in

the Vulgate and to make herself clear to a certain extent in writing, for many nuns in the Benedictine Order in the twelfth century could both read and write Latin. It is clear from the headings to her letters that she was not highly educated, for she describes herself as an unlearned woman; but this would not preclude a small knowledge of Latin in a nun whose principal occupation was saying the divine office in Latin.

Many Protestant writers and some Catholics also have put down Elizabeth's visions to the work of Eckbert, considering that he wrote them in order to bring the monastery into renown, but on the face of it this seems unlikely, for he was a devout, steadfast man, incapable of such deception. As a religious he was a zealous monk, edifying his contemporaries by his learning and piety; he was well known as a writer and preacher and as a defender of the faith against the Cathars, German heretics who held Nestorian views. The internal evidence of the visions goes to show that his transcription of them was genuine, for he did not cut out the places in which Elizabeth mentioned that he had suggested many of the questions out of Holy Scripture which he wished her to put to the angel, which seems to show that he believed in his sister's gifts and looked upon her revelations as divinely inspired, and so asked the questions to enrich his own theological knowledge.

Herr Roth says on this subject "that if the revelations are not divine, they are certainly the outcome of the spiritual life of Elizabeth, handed down to us after her relation by Eckbert." He thinks it probable that Eckbert suppressed the incredible and the womanly fantasies in the visions, in order not to throw discredit upon the whole. In his letter to Abbot Reinach, of Rheinhausen, Eckbert says that he attributed Elizabeth's visions to supernatural origin, and Herr Roth considers the visions were undoubtedly genuine and that any attempt to prove that Eckbert invented them is doomed to failure.

According to many writers, Eckbert himself died in the odor of sanctity. It is certain that on the old Abbot Hildelin's death he was considered the most worthy monk to succeed him and that he then devoted all his powers to the care of the monastery and the schools in which he took a great interest. He held the post of abbot, according to Trithemius, for eighteen years, and on his death, which happened about 1185, he was buried in the place he had himself chosen, near the high altar in the monastery church of Schönau, by the side of his sister.

Before we turn to the visions themselves, it may be as well to say a few words as to the character of Elizabeth's writings, which in the Middle Ages were widely known and much honored, for a great many copies of the manuscript were made and still exist. It is an interesting question how much St. Bridget may unconsciously have owed to her mystical ancestress' revelations, though there is a wide difference between the terrible denunciations of evildoers and severe judgments and prophetic warnings of the great Swedish prophetess and the simpler utterances of the gentle German abbess.

Since a simple, childlike spirit is a predominant note in German piety, it is not surprising to find that simplicity and an absence of all affectation of learning characterize the revelations of our saint. She is always so natural, often naive, and though she never reaches such depth of thought as St. Hildegarde or such terrific imagery as the revelation of St. Bridget of Sweden display, she is much easier to understand than either of these visionaries and possesses a certain charm which both these greater women lack.

Elizabeth was a child of her age, interested in the things it was concerned with, such as the Papal schism, the struggles of the regulars and seculars, the search after relics and a great predilection for legends. The visions are divided into three books. In the beginning of the first book Elizabeth explains how she came to write them, and justifies herself for so doing in these words: "Thou askest me, brother, and for this thou camest that I should narrate to thee the mercies of the Lord, which He has deigned to work in me according to the good pleasure of His grace. I am ready certainly to satisfy thee, for my soul has long desired this, that it should be given me to confer with thee concerning all these things and to hear thy judgment.

"Perhaps there are some who say that I am of some sanctity, and they attribute favor of God to my merits, judging me to be something when I am nothing. But others think among themselves, saying: 'If this woman was a servant of God, she would be silent and not permit her name to be magnified upon earth, not knowing by what forces I am accustomed to be urged to speak.' Also there are some who say that all these things which they hear from me are womanly figments, or perhays they judge me to be deluded by Satan. In these and other ways, dearest, it will behoove me to be spoken of in the mouths of men.

"Sometimes it happens that when I should have been able to hide these things in my heart which were shown me by the Lord such pains of the heart have seized me that I thought myself to be close to death, but when I disclosed to those who were round me what I had seen I was alleviated immediately. But I confess I am uncertain how I ought to act. For I understand it to be dangerous to me to be silent concerning the great things of God and to speak

I fear greatly may be much more dangerous. For I have not sufficient discretion to know which of these which are revealed to me it is convenient to tell, and which it is proper to honor with silence. And behold, between these things I am placed in danger of falling.

"On account of this, my beloved, my eyes do not cease from weeping and my spirit is continually vexed within me. But my soul begins to be consoled with your coming and a great peace is within me. And now I will not hide my heart from thee, but will open to thee both the good and the evil concerning me.

"I, the least of his poor, give thanks to God, because from the day when I began to live under regular institution up to this hour the hand of the Lord is confirmed upon me, and never have I failed to carry His arrows in my body. My various and daily sicknesses have not only vexed me, but also all the Sisters who are round about me. May the Lord have mercy upon them, because they have borne with maternal affection the burden of my calamity with me. Sometimes they gave me medicines for my ailments, but I became much worse with them, and I heard in a nocturnal vision a voice saying to me: 'But our God did all things whatsoever He would in secret.' Then I understood that I was admonished that I should not commit my body to the medicines of men, but to the will of my Creator, and so indeed I did, and often when I was overwhelmed with so much languor that I had the mastery of no member except my tongue without arrogance, I would say that I remained in a chair ruminating upon the Psalms. But when paralysis deprived me of my tongue I supplied its office with my mind.

"But it would be long to enumerate how many deprivations of necessary things I bore in my infirmities. But I will now turn to those things without further delay concerning which you have inquired of me."

The three first visions which she now goes on to describe are of the devil, by whom Elizabeth was, as she says, grievously tormented not only to unbelief, but even to suicide. The fourth vision we will translate, as it is highly characteristic of the visions of this saint:

"When the Mass of the Blessed Virgin was finished, for it was Saturday, I fell into an ecstasy and my heart was opened, and I saw in the air a wheel of great light like a full moon, but double the size. And I looked into the midst of the wheel and I saw the likeness of a royal woman, standing on high, clothed in the whitest vestments and with an outer garment of purple. I understood immediately that she was the sublime Queen of Heaven and

the Mother of our Lord, whom I had always desired to see. And when with desire I had reached out to her, she fell on her face three times adoring before a certain divine light which was before her. But the fourth time when she had humbled herself she was seen to lie there for a long time. But as she arose she turned her face to me and proceeded a little way towards me in the lower air, having two glorious companions, one on the right hand and one on the left. He who was on the right seemed to be clothed in a monk's cowl, but it was very white, and in his hand was the monastic rod of the Father. Then it struck me that this was our holy father St. Benedict. But he on the left hand side seemed to be a beautiful youth with white and curly hair. But my Lady, standing, made the sign of the cross over me, and in what way I know not these words were as it were inserted in my mind: 'Fear not, for none of these things shall hurt you.' I did not, indeed, hear the sound of the voice, but I saw distinctly the movement of her lips in that way.

"After she had stepped back into the interior of her light, I, adoring, followed her with thirteen little verses of the praises which I was accustomed to use. And these being said, I came out of my ecstasy and immediately refreshed my spirit with Holy Communion. Then I asked the priest that he would invoke the name of the Lord over me, Who when he had begun the litany I again fell into an ecstasy. And again I saw our Lady standing by the side of the altar in a garment like a chasuble of a priest, and she had on her head a glorious diadem, as if set with four precious jewels, and round it was written the angelic salutation, 'Ave Maria gratia plena Dominus tecum.'"

On the vigil of St. John the Baptist Elizabeth describes a vision in which he appeared to her clad in a white robe and turning a most amiable face to her, as though he wished her to look at him.

On the feast one year of SS. Peter and Paul Elizabeth fell into an ecstasy and saw these glorious princes standing in a great and splendid light, with the signs of victorious martyrs. Our Lady then appeared standing before them, and St. Peter made the sign of the cross over her, and she saluted him, saying: 'Thou art the shepherd of the sheep, Prince of the Apostles,' and watching a little while she heard these words: 'I have fought the good fight; I have finished my course,' and when they had returned to their region of light she breathed out of her ecstasy."

She thus continues her description of this vision: "That day at Mass, while the office was being intoned, I saw a dove descending from heaven, and it went to the right horn of the altar, and there it sat. It was like a turtle dove and whiter than snow. And

when the lord abbot said this collect among others, 'God to Whom all hearts are opened,' and reached the words 'purify the thoughts of our hearts by the infusion of the Holy Spirit,' it flew, and circling his head three times it returned to the place where it was before sitting. But when the Sanctus was said it came and sat on the corporal and something like a ruby seemed to hang from its mouth. And when Mass was finished I went to Communion among the Sisters, and I bent the eyes of my flesh to it and I was not able to see it. But my eyes being turned away, I saw it, and for the fear which I had of it immediately that I had communicated, I fell into an ecstasy presently I breathed. And thenceforth any saint of any celebrity among us, each on his feast, appeared to me by the favor of God in celestial light."

The next visions in this first book describe the appearances of various saints, St. Stephen, St. Mary Magdalene, St. Margaret, St. James, Blessed Cristina and frequently our Lady, and it is all told in the same simple way without any circumlocution, and rarely are any words except those of Holy Scripture attributed to the saints who appear.

The patrons of Eckbert's church at Bonn were two martyrs named Cassius and Florentius, and he while still a canon of Bonn wrote to Elizabeth and asked her for some revelation concerning them, to which she replies as follows in vision 29:

"Thou hast asked me in a letter, brother, concerning your patrons, i. e., the martyrs of the church at Bonn, Cassius and Florentius, that on their birthday I would do them some service, so that perhaps they would deign to show themselves to me, and I did what I could. For in their honor I said that day fifty psalms after Matins, when also the devil extinguished my candle, which I held in my hand. But after this about the third hour I went into an ecstasy without pain, and I saw three splendid men in the region of light, decorated with palms and crowns, adorned in the front with red. But two stood joined to each other, and after a little while they were united to a third.

"On the following day at Vespers, when according to my custom I was in ecstasy, for it was Saturday, I asked the Lord that He would show me again those two patrons, for I was troubled because I did not know distinctly who these might be of whom thou askest me, because I saw three. And the Lord delayed to hear me for a time, so that I feared I had asked something against His will. And I said trembling, 'Lord, if it be Thy Will which I ask, let it be done, but if not, let it not be done.' And immediately I saw two men exceedingly amiable from among the company of martyrs proceeding with the signs mentioned above, who came in and

stood in the midst before the sight of the throne. And I awakened with joy, and immediately I heard these words: 'These are two olive trees standing before the throne of the Lord, the governor of the whole earth.'"

The visions of St. Elizabeth, as we have said, nearly always corresponded to the feast on which she saw them; during the last four days of Holy Week she had visions of the Passion of our Lord, and these were preceded by severe illness and such pain that the Sisters thought she was dying. These visions closely correspond with the account given in the Gospels of the Passion of our Lord. When the Sisters assembled in the chapter house on Maundy Thursday for the washing of the feet, they carried Elizabeth, ill as she was, to her place, and she fell into an ecstasy, in which she saw the whole scene in the upper chamber at Jerusalem, when our Lord washed the feet of St. Peter and the other apostles.

On Good Friday she saw the whole Passion, on Easter Day the scene of the Resurrection in the garden, on Pentecost the descent of the Holy Ghost on our Lady and the Apostles. All these visions she describes simply and naturally as they are told in the Gospels, without any additions of her own to the facts of the narrative. There is, as a rule, an absence of all extravagance in the visions of Schönau, which with their simple style and close correspondence with Holy Scripture gives them a claim to our acceptance. They may not strike us as divine revelations, but we always feel they are the outpourings of a very holy soul, unsaturated with Holy Scripture, in the meditation of which her mind has been steeped and colored.

The visions were nearly always preceded by illness, pain and languor, and then she fell into the ecstatic state, sometimes preceded by convulsions. Sometimes all vital functions seemed to be suspended, and she was so lifeless that the Sisters thought she was dead.

The second and third books of the visions are less simple; the visions are darker and more artistic; they contain more explanations of Scripture and show more theological learning, and two letters from Elizabeth to her contemporary visionary, St. Hildegarde, are inserted in them; no dates are given to these visions. The second book opens as follows:

"The mercy of God is kind, and richly does He shower grace upon grace on those who love Him. According to the greatness of His goodness, He has multiplied His consolations upon His handmaid, as the preceding book declares, and behold, nevertheless, His hand is extended to console her. For the murmuring of those who judge themselves to be great and who spurn those who appear

to be weak is not repressed, for they do not fear to mock at the richness of His goodness in her. Nevertheless, it is to be feared that in murmuring they will hear the voice of the father saying to the servant: 'Is thy eye evil because mine is good?' This scandalizes them; that in these days the Lord has deigned to magnify His mercy much in the weaker sex. But why do they not remember that it was so in the days of our fathers when it was given to foolish men that holy women were filled with the spirit of God, that they might prophesy, that they might govern the people of God strenuously, that they might also triumph over the people of Israel as Deborah, Judith, Jael and the like? And now because we may hope to find things of edification in the minds of the humble, those things also which the Lord has deigned to work in His handmaid after the end of the first book, according to her own narrative, are here added."

From this we may gather that Elizabeth had suffered from ridicule on account of her sex. The following vision shows what trust the rest of the community placed in her revelations:

"And immediately the angel of the Lord bore me away, and we came to a green and pleasant meadow. And behold, there appeared three beautiful girls walking by the side of a certain river, whose clothes were not very white; they were discalced and their feet were very red. And when I wondered who they were and what they were doing there alone, they said to me: 'Do not be astonished: we are souls, and we were placed under regular discipline, one of us from a little child, one from youth and one from an older age. And because we seemed to be of some merit among men, when we died we were helped less than was necessary by the prayers of men. And when we should have been able to have been liberated within the space of one year, behold, now we have been detained here thirty years. We do not, indeed, bear other pains except a great fear, which we have from three terrible dogs who constantly threaten to bite us. If you will ask your abbot that he would offer the divine sacrifice for the delivery of our souls and the souls of all the faithful departed, we hope to be delivered more quickly and to be able to pass over to the joys prepared for us.' When I pointed out these things to our Sisters they met together and with a devout mind submitted to bodily penance in common for them and divided the psalter between them, praying with all diligence to the Lord for the delivery of these souls.

"VIII. But the lord abbot, warned by me, came the next day when the office of the vigil was said and celebrated the divine office for the faithful departed carefully. And again in the same time of sacrifice I was translated to the place above mentioned, and the

same souls again appeared ascending with great haste against the course of the aforesaid river. And I, joining myself to them, inquired from whence they came and what were their names. One of them answered for all. 'It would take long to tell thee all about us, but I will answer thee briefly; we are from Saxony; I am called Adelheid, and the one who is next to me is Matilda, my sister in the flesh as well as in the spirit; but this one, Elizabeth, is only our spiritual sister. But I, seeing that they were unwilling to delay, did not wish to detain them longer, but I commended myself and all our congregation to them more attentively, that when they should be received into the company of saints they would remember us. Which when they had kindly promised they began to proceed more quickly. And behold, in the way which they pursued the angel of the Lord appeared before them in the likeness of a beautiful youth, and as if offering to lead them, went before them with the same haste. And when they had drawn near to a certain building in which I frequently see blessed souls received, three venerable men came out to them, each having a golden thurible in his hand, and they offered incense to each of them. And presently out of the smoke of the incense their faces and clothing were washed whiter than snow, and thus they were happily led into the interior of the building."

There is one other delightful vision which at the risk of wearying our readers we should like to quote, because it is so thoroughly characteristic of German mysticism. Any one conversant with the revelations of St. Bridget of Sweden will see at once how unlike her dark and stern denunciations were these dreamlike visions of her gentle German sister:

"Immediately afterwards the angel of the Lord carried me into another place of most delightful pleasantness and placed me under a certain tree, which was covered with the most beautiful flowers. And I said to him: 'My Lord, let us rest a while in this place.' And he said: 'It is pleasing to me that thou shouldst rest.' Presently I sat down on the grass and filled my hand with flowers, which were lying everywhere around me and drawing them nearer to me, I extracted a wonderful sweet smell from them. And when I had desired to stay there longer I saw far off an exceedingly venerable man coming towards us and two most beautiful virgins with him.

"And my Lord, who was standing beside me, said to me: 'Behold, our Lord Peter is coming.' Immediately rising, I went to meet him, and falling down before him, begged his patronage humbly, and committed myself and my dear ones to him. He, turning and looking at me mercifully with clemency, said: 'Tell

thy abbot that Brother Laurence is waiting for an obedience from him.' And I said to him: 'And what may I hope from thee, Lord?' Who said: 'You may have good hope in me and my other apostles for him; he is accustomed to show devout obedience to us.' And when he was borne away from me the angel said to me: 'Come and I will show thee one of the Brothers of my monastery.' And he showed me in the place of refreshment a certain monk who was called Erminricus and another certain one of our Brothers by name Gerhard, whom he said was quickly about to arrive at the same place."

The third book of the visions is mostly taken up in answering questions which her brother Eckbert had put to her and belongs to what Herr Roth calls the second period of her work. It does not lend itself to quotation easily, as the sections into which it is divided are often several pages long, but it contains two letters to St. Hildegarde, too long to quote in full, from which it is possible to give extracts. Both are rather epistles than letters in the modern sense of the word, but parts of them are interesting, because they throw some light on the writer's relations with the external world and what she had to suffer from it.

The first letter opens formally thus:

"To the venerable lady, mistress of the spouses of Christ who are in Mount St. Rupert, Elizabeth, a humble nun, sends devout prayer with all charity. May the grace and consolation of the Most High fill you with joy because you kindly have compassion on my distress, as I understood from the words of my consoler, from whom you have diligently secured consolation from me. For, as you said, it had been revealed to you concerning me, I confess that lately I conceived in my mind a certain cloud of confusion on account of the impertinent words which many people have spoken of me which are not true. But I should easily bear the words of the common people if those who wear the religious habit did not sadden my spirit more bitterly. For with what incentives these are moved I do not know, who laugh at the grace of God in me, and those who are ignorant do not fear to judge me rashly.

"They have spread an evil report about me that I have prophesied concerning the judgment day, which certainly I never presumed to do, when the knowledge of His advent escapes all mortals."

She then goes on to say how to avoid arrogance; she had striven to hide the things which had been revealed to her, as about to happen on account of the wickedness of the people, and thus relates what ensued to her in consequence. "When, therefore, on a certain Sunday I in my accustomed manner was in ecstasy and the angel of the Lord stood by me, saying: 'Wherefore dost thou hide thy

gold in mud? This is the Word of God which is sent to the earth through thy mouth, not that on account of distorted faces it should be hidden, but that it should be shown to the praise and glory of our God for the salvation of His people.' And saying this he raised a whip over me, which he inflicted on me five times as if in great anger most severely, so that for three days I was faint in all my body from that beating."

A little further on in this letter Elizabeth writes that the abbot began to divulge some of her revelations to the magistrates of the Church and to some religious men, some of whom received them with reverence, but some spoke badly of the angel through whom she received them, saying he was a deluding spirit transfigured into an angel of light. And through obedience the abbot constrained her that when he appeared again she should ask him in the name of the Lord to show her whether he was a true angel of God or not. She did not so trembling, and the angel assured her he was a true angel of God, and that her visions were true and her prophecies would become true unless God was reconciled with man."

She concludes the letter by asking Hildegarde's prayers and begging her to write to her again.

It is clear from the above that Elizabeth firmly believed in her own visions, and it is equally clear from her letters to others that there were many people who also believed in them, besides her own brother and the community of Schönau. The preface to the letters of Elizabeth in one of the original manuscripts thus describes their origin:

"A certain monk from the Abbey of Dusindorf, in the Diocese of Metz, very learned in sacred knowledge, came to Schönau to visit Elizabeth and to see what God had done in her. And when she had been vehemently congratulated by him and he had faithfully instructed her with good counsels, when about to depart he asked if he might sometimes merit to receive from her a letter, from which he might receive some good counsel and consolation. He also begged her at the same time to send a letter to his abbot and Brothers to correct and admonish them. And when he had reverently commended this to the divine favor, that same night his petition was made while Elizabeth was present at Matins, she suddenly pronounced an improvised letter, which the aforesaid Brother had asked to be sent to him. Likewise on the third night after this she pronounced another letter, which he had asked to be sent to his abbot and Brothers. From that time she began to have the grace of dictating letters in this way, which are here written down."

The letters contain excellent spiritual counsels and are distinctly

Scriptural in tone, but as there is a great similarity in them, except that in some she narrates one of her visions, the quotation of one or two will give a very good idea of the whole of them, so we will quote the letter to the abbot asked for by the monk alluded to in the preface to the letters:

"Elizabeth by the grace of God to the abbot of Dusindorf: A certain divine inspiration admonishes thee, O servant of God. Bring out, raise and extend thy pastoral staff and strike boldly and gently dispose all things round thy sheep whom thou hast received to rule and guard. For every one has followed his own heart, declining and stepping unjustly from the way of contemplation. On this account God will not give you necessary things for food. Go back, sons of God, sons of light, to your hearts and ask your consciences if there is anything in you which is not well pleasing to Him at whom all the earth trembles. Amend; do better; you have a Father Who dwells on high and looks on the humble. Be unwilling to give room in your hearts that this and that may enter. Spurn the world and all the ornaments of the world, on account of the love of God, that you may be able to see the King in His beauty and the author of life Who invites you to the feast of the citizens on high, where the Father remains in the Son and the Son in the Father with the Holy Spirit for ever."

The letters are all couched in Biblical language, and many of them begin as the following one to the Archbishop of Trêves: "A certain little spark sent out from the great seat of Majesty and a voice thundering in the heart of the same, a little woman to the Archbishop of Trêves."

More than thirty MSS. of Elizabeth's writings exist; there is one in the British Museum of the thirteenth century; there was one at Cheltenham, in Gloucestershire, belonging to Sir Thomas Philipps, now the property of his heirs, and there is one in the Bodleian. Others are in various places in Germany, some in private and some in public collections; there are some in Cistercian convents in Austria, several in Paris and Bonn, and some in Munich, Brussels and Trêves.

We will conclude this account of St. Elizabeth with the opening verse of a Latin poem in praise of the saint written by Abbot Emecho, who succeeded Abbot Eckbert at Schönau:

Salve felix Elizabeth Odorifera rosa, In Dei mirabilibus Virgo satis famosa,

F. M. STEELE.

PRESSURA GENTIUM.

T IS a commonplace of Latin Literature that the Vulgate continues the tradition of Tacitus. The neat, terse style, plated with epigrams, that condenses into a single phrase the vaporous essence of some idea, waited for a master hand to refashion it. Its glittering brilliancy was hidden under the ashes of the Agricola, the Germania, the Annales. Then some unknown, unnamed, forgotten scribe penned from the circuit of Carthage a Latin Bible. He poured the sacred wine from the Greek into the Latin, drop by brilliant drop, spilling none. Critics of English prose, like Ruskin and Matthew Arnold; scholars of classic style, like Tyrrell and MacKall, are at one in calling attention to this patent fact. But alas! the Vulgate has the defect of its good qualities. It is untranslatable. The tightly packed sentences have to be loosened before they can be transformed. Nor are any more quick to admit this than that band of scholars, the best that Oxford then could boast, known as the Douay translators. In their frank preface to the edition of 1600 they quaintly forestall much obvious criticism: "Now for the strictness observed in translating some wordes, or rather the not translating of some which is in more danger to be misliked, we doubt not but that the discrete lerned reader, deepely weighing and considering the importance of sacred wordes and how easely the translatour may misse the sense of the Holie Ghost, wil hold that which is here doune for reasonable and necessarie."

Certainly when they depart from the Latin they lose in strength and vigor. Thus in one expression made use of by our Lord in describing the terrors of His "visitation" (Luke xxi., 25), we have the phrase pressura gentium. They, alike with the versions termed Authorized and Revised, term it "the distress of nations." Luther's German bange has the same idea of fear. But surely the Latin is more pregnant with meaning. It is a word-picture after Tacitus. It suggests a huddled group of peoples, driven by oncoming hordes of fiercer and more desperate tribes. We are poised by the metaphor over the scene of terror. We gaze at troops of men following, like the headstrong rush of wild waves, on the heels of a flying foe. And upon the back of these, stretching far out as in some deep-drawn picture of Dorè, others can be dimly discerned trampling upon all that bars their roadway. The so-called Wycliffe Bible, which Abbot Gasquet has taught us to hold as the old Catholic version, tries, by building on the older Anglo-Saxon phrasing, to depict all this in its "overlaying of folks."

Indeed, is this not a precise picture of each crisis of the Church's life? Has it not been one long-continuous "overlaying of folks," an ever-present, ever-constant *pressura gentium?* The Church has been assailed in increasing energy, at one time by the literal, material overcrowding of barbarous peoples as from her first century to her ninth; at another by the no less terrible overcrowding of ideas, a *pressura idearum*.

Says St. Bede: "At times the Church has been so afflicted with the press of nations, nay, even so defiled, that Christ our Lord would seem to have forsaken her." 1 At first the faithful were agitated by the pressure of the Gentiles. The opening of the gates of God's kingdom by St. Peter to Cornelius the Centurion was the first shock to the consciences of the Judaic Christians. The solid body converted from the Hebrew peoples in the earliest beginnings of Christianity seemed intentionally to show that the New Law was out engrafted on the Old. This second dispensation was looked up as the fulfillment of the Messianic prophecies, and therefore as a development of Israelitish ideals. Hence the Gentiles who began to flock to the Church, especially through the mediation and preaching of St. Paul, found themselves expected to become not Christians merely, but Jews; to be not merely baptized, but circumcised. They were to be naturalized to the New Kingdom through the ceremonies of the Mosaic dispensation. Fierce upheavals resulted. The Church passed through her first crisis. The vigorous Apostle of the Gentiles, though a Pharisee and a Hebrew of the Hebrews, spoke hot words in their defense, and his arguments showed the true lines along which the Church was to move. Then Judaism fell off and was lost; but Christianity was saved. For not in Jerusalem, but in pagan Antioch, the step was taken; "the disciples were first named Christians."

The next great milestone along the roadway of the Church stood over against the conversion of Constantine. Rome became Christian, and at once the danger arose lest Christianity should become Roman. Instead of the catacombs and a gens lucifuga came the basilicas of the Church and the General Council of Nicæa. Here, thought the released believers, at last is peace. In their eyes an emperor, a Cæsar, had taken his place in the life of the Church. The edict of 312 seemed a beginning of what the civil authority might do for the glory of God. The dream of the classic poets, upon whom rested the vision of an eternal empire, appeared passing into fact. The golden, half-lit splendor of patriotic imperialism, such as Virgil sang of in the inspired lines of the Sixth Book of his "Æneid," was approaching in gorgeous pageantry, not through

¹ Hom, in Mark 6, Bk. 2, Cap. 28, Migne, L. P. Vol. XCII., p. 196.

portals of ivory, but through portals of horn; not a lying vision, but a glorious reality. Rome became identified with Christianity. Its allies were thought to be the friends of Christ, its enemies His sworn foes. The old horror of Rome displayed in the Apocalypse, that shudder passing through the frame of St. John the Divine when he mentions "Babylon the great drunk with the blood of the saints and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus," has given way to a new feeling of pride, admiration, love for that home of saints where lay the bodies of the Twin Prince Apostles. The Empire was supposed, despite its patent corruptions and misrule and its interference with effective Church government, to stand for the unique type of Christianity. St. Jerome, whose pen spared few and whose tongue spared fewer, was overwhelmed at the rumor of the sack of Rome: "A terrible report reaches us from the West. They talk of Rome besieged, ransomed with gold, besieged again, so that lives may perish after property has been destroyed. My voice is choked; sobs stifle the words I am dictating."2 How, we ask in astonishment, can the fierce, passionate, stern saint feel reverence for that city he had himself not seldom denounced as a den of thieves? How can he venture to identify Rome with the same city of Jerusalem or quote of her the old words of Virgil: Ouid salvum est si Roma berit?3 Yet, nevertheless, St. Jerome did represent one side of Christian feeling in the fifth century. He stood for a vast body of the faithful who linked up the fortunes of the Church with the material empire of the Roman name. The fall of Rome could be for them but a prelude to the end of the world.4 "Who can bear witness to the truth of Christ's terrible predictions," says St. Ambrose, "so well as we upon whom the end of the world is come?" Here, then, precisely once again lay the old difficulty. An old social organization was crumbling to ruin, new peoples were coming in contact with the Church. Once again it is pressura gentium. What, then, will be the Church's attitude to the heathen? St. Ierome can but lament. For him in Rome's fall fell all the world. Nor is it a mere literary exaggeration, for his point of view became an actual working principle, as when the British Bishops steadily refused to make any attempt to convert the Saxons or even to cooperate with the Roman monks.

But these Roman monks show us other ideas, and ideas which ultimately prevailed. The baptism of Constantine was followed

² Migne, L. P. XXII., 1,094, ep. 127.

³ Ibid, 1,059, ep. 124.

⁴ Lactantius, Iustit. VII., 25, Migne, P. L. VI., 812-813.

⁵ In Lk. 21, lib. 10, Migne, P. L. XV., 1898.

by the baptism of Clovis, to prove that the Church was not bound to any particular political system.

For St. Augustine, lamenting as bitterly as St. Jerome the fall of the world's metropolis, yet discerns even here the working out of God's laws. Even through the hollow eyes of death he sees life peering. Brooding over the broken walls that crowned the Seven Hills, hovering across the marble grandeur of palace, basilica, Coliseum, his eyes beheld the vision splendid of the city of God "coming down out of heaven, adorned as a bride for her husband." With wider faith St. Augustine sees a new Christianity rising out of a world "shattered in shard on shard." No human power, no human destiny can entangle the Church in its life. These things are of their nature temporary, while the Church is eternal. The city of God and the city of the world may exist side by side, but must never be confused. The world may be influenced for the better, or its contaminating atmosphere may affect God's children, for there is an unending struggle battled between the two standards. But the city whose maker and builder is God cannot have its foundations laid by men, nor are its stones set together by human cement.

Here, then, was a theory that answered the laments of St. Jerome. St. Augustine took up the burden of St. Paul and fought in writing for the liberty of the sons of God. These were to be no longer cramped by the narrow limits even of the Empire of Rome, for God was greater than Romulus. The new peoples had rights as human souls to participate in the benefits of the Church. And whither St. Augustine pointed, St. Leo and St. Gregory led. The old world was left to fall to pieces of its own decay. The dead were left to bury their dead.

When the Popes began again their work of reconstruction the precedent of the basilicas was followed. The heathen temples were not overthrown, but hallowed into Christian use. All that was good in these younger peoples, their reverence for women, their detestation of idolatrous worship, their love of nature, their fearlessness, their freedom, their enthusiasm, was not destroyed, but fulfilled. A chivalrous devotion to the Maiden Mother, an architecture inspired by nature, emancipation from slavery, and the Crusades betoken the Church's use of her new subjects. The pressura gentium abates. There is no longer a huddling, crowding, overlaying of Christendom. A new epoch leaps into being. The Popes create that strange paradox—civilized barbarism. They have broken the entanglement of Imperial Rome. Like John at the Latin Gate, the Church emerges from her trial purior et vegetior, purified and with renewed energy.

The resulting stage of the world's history we call by the name of feudalism. It is Christendom's new form, though in general it stands for many social processes in many different lands that shade down from the sixth to the fifteenth century. But it enabled the Church once more to fit herself in with human life. She takes her position, no mean one, in the world's polity. A theory is broached by which she accepts by the will of the people the hegemony of the nations. She transfers the Empire from Greek to German, and in recompense is allowed to sit in judgment on each elected representative of the new line of Cæsars. She crowns the emperors, anoints the kings, stands by and hallows the newly dubbed knights. Her Bishops sit in the royal council chambers and help in the efficient working of the courts of justice. Her clerics are a race apart, to be judged by their own laws and their own judges. Yet for all this she made no little return. She spread abroad brightness, color, joy amid the working classes. She did her best to garner the precious grains of the rich classic harvest. She diffused the light of knowledge among peoples who sat in darkness. She tilled fields and drained fens, and built cathedrals and universities, and broke out into art and music and song. She took tithes from her people, but gave tithes also to her people of what was most precious in all the world. She set high a moral excellence in king and Bishop, in monk and knight, in burgher and hind that makes the Ages of Faith an astonishing epoch, without equal or rival in the records of the children of men.

But alas! for human weakness! She became enriched; eventually she became enslaved. She became even as she had become upon the latter days of the Roman Empire, entangled with a system. Even St. Bernard saw it necessary to exhort the Pope to follow not Cæsar, but the Apostles. Here once again there comes the visitation of God. A new spirit began to walk abroad. The old theories were in their turn breaking up. Fresh theories began to be mooted different, divergent, yet somehow bearing a common impress. From the fifteenth century onwards the zeitgeist was heavy with the new learning. It seemed at first but an enthusiasm for literature. It talked much about Greek manuscripts and Latin classics. It built shrines to Plato and doffed its cap at the mention of Aristotle's name. It even took up the morality of the ancient world, giving truth again to Epicurus and Zeno. It affected the workings of men's minds in every department of life. It grafted itself on national feeling, sympathized with the lawyers of Philippe le Bel, praised the outrage of Anagni, which had wrung even from Dante (for whom Boniface VIII. was a lost soul) a hot, passionate protest. It worked out its way through long underground

passages, chasing its ideal down far-reaching corridors, peering for it behind the arras. The unsubstantial ghost was at length brought to light, or rather it stalked gauntly out into the open. Men saw and recognized it and called it the spirit of secularization. But its real name was different, more hideous. It was but one side of the classic spirit, one side—over-developed—of mediæval feudalism. It was when naked and unashamed nothing but royal absolutism in State, rank erastianism in Church. The leaders of the world were great men, of astonishing genius, of versatile powers, of wonderful address. They were lions, but as Bacon fitly held them to be, "lions under the throne." How would the Church deal with this world grown so strange? The Imperial Pope, the Papal Emperor tramping, journeying to Bethlehem as we see them in the frescoes of Gozzoli and others, had journeyed into eternity. Their place in the world's hierarchy knew them no more. All that they stood for had fallen with them. Many, indeed, looked back, clung to these mediæval hopes, and worked for their return. But it was not to be. Once more the Church was forced to go out from her splendid dwellings, once more to leave the dead to bury their dead.

It was not now the physical pressure of hordes flooding Europe from East to West with successive waves, but it was a spring of water rising from the Church's own depths that threatened to destroy and overturn all. The incident of Julius II. and Bramante at the rebuilding of St. Peter's is a symbol. The Pope agreed to every condition. Honored and traditional decorations, treasures, pictures, statues that were loved by the people were sacrificed to the new artistic ideals. He only refused his assent when Bramante wished to move the position of the Tomb of the Apostles. This desire for change was intended, said Julius, to affect even the rock upon which the Church was built. Perhaps at no other epoch had the Church of God more difficulty in endeavoring to adapt herself to contemporary politics. For the first time in her history she seemed quite unable to find where her foot might rest in the flood. She became utterly restless. Theologians threw out schemes for making the Church and absolutism somehow in compromise. In this Paolo Sarpi is a type of many liberal churchmen. But his efforts availed little. For there was quite a host of writers who. insisting on the teaching of Aquinas, justified tyrannicide as an extreme measure, and tyrannicide was an abomination in the eyes of the new statesmen. Moreover, the Church could not surrender the Catholic aspect of the faith, so she lost the Northern peoples, whose rationalistic ideals had been so enormously increased. She lost also, even over the Latin races, her true jurisdiction. For in

France, Spain, Portugal and in the Italian States the ecclesiastical body was completely under government. Politically and socially the Church in every land could no longer call itself with truth the Church Catholic. From the Renaissance to the Revolution the faith ceased to tell with force on human life. Only in her burst of missionary zeal in the new countries, in her spirit of reform in discipline and morals in the old and in the bright galaxy of her saints do we see any patent showings of her divinity. The pressura idearum paralyzed her and forced her for the time to step right out of the world's working.

With the Revolution the Church reasserted her influence on social life. It gave the Church once more an opportunity to take up the burden of empire. For the Revolution was no mere outburst of destruction. It came as a conclusion, necessary, inevitable, legitimate to a long series of causes. It was built up on a succession of terrible evils, untempered for the most part by the consolations of religion, for the clergy of France were out of sympathy, certainly out of touch, with the people. When the crash came there were to be found, it is true, many ecclesiastics worthy of the traditions of the French Church. Yet, on the whole, it was rather as martyrs than as apostles. They were ready to die for their faith; but had no idea how to teach their flocks to live by it.

The Revolution fatally followed on the evils of absolutism. When its fury was spent the eternal problem faced the Church. occasioned by the ever-recurring pressura gentium, or rather, as always in the latter days, pressura idearum. The old question was asked again, though couched in a newer language: How should the Church bear herself to the new peoples? It is still subjudice. The end is not yet, though after a hundred years the problem is fast reaching its crucial issue, for it is plain now that the Revolution meant no mere upheaval, but a rearrangement of society under the rule of the workingman. Said Lacordaire: "Si la Revolution n'eût étè qu'un crime, elle eût expiré au pied de l'echafaud de Louis XV."6 It could not have been a mere crime, though undoubtedly crimes neither few nor small were part of its deaththroes. Indeed, the Church has stood to gain enormously by it. She once more finds herself included in the people's life. She is stronger, more dignified, more respected, more loved than at any time since the Renaissance. As once she assisted at the baptism of Constantine and of Clovis, so now she has witnessed the christening of the workingman. Leo XIII., the People's Pope, wrote his Rerum Novarum and other encyclicals to teach the whole duty of labor. Lacordaire, Ozanam, Montalembert; Wiseman, Manning,

⁶ La loi de l'Histoire.

Spalding; Kettler, Windthorst, Lueger, have worked out the attitude of the Church to the people. They have not feared to teach the gospel of freedom of the Church untrammeled by government veto, of education freed from the cramping fetters of dogmatic agnosticism, of social reform founded on the dignity and rights of labor. These wise and broadminded leaders have had the official blessing of three successive Popes. The present Pontiff, himself called, like the first of his own great line, from a lowly occupation to the priesthood and eventually to the solicitude of all the churches, has shown the same interest in the welfare of the masses. "La societé moderne," cried Lacordaire, "est l'expression des besoins de l'humanité, et par consequent elle est aussi l'expression des besoins de l'Eglise. Nous sentons aujourd'hui le besoin que nous avons les uns des autres; allons au-devant du monde, qui lui-même nous recherche et nous attend."

There have been and there are many who look back to the past with regret and look forward to the future with fear. They dislike the advance of a power which to them spells the breakup of all civilization. Their eyes dimly pierce through the veils that hide the future round about. Like St. Jerome, they weep disconsolate over a falling system. They would wish to bring back the quiet past.

On the other hand are many who look to the new forces as something sacrosanct. The new democracy, a Christian Socialism, they extol from many platforms as being the social organization ordained by the Master in His Gospel. They say that Christianity must be socialistic, that the Church is bound by her own spiritual laws to defend the oppressed and that the only defense of these oppressed now can come from a socialistic state. They echo the words of the labor leader at Leeds that Christ was the first trades unionist.

Both parties alike are impatient with the Church, the one that she will not join the hue and cry against the Socialists, the other that she will not join her millions of children to the ranks of the new forces. Yet the action of the Church, to those who have eyes to see, is justified by history. She has never joined herself to any social or political hierarchic arrangement. She is greater than any, vaster, older. She cannot cramp herself down to adopt any as her own, or identify herself with any. She will outlive them all. St. Jerome thought all was lost when Rome was sacked in 409; St. Augustine built the Church upon the inrushing peoples. Both empire and peoples have gone, yet the Church remains. Constantine, Clovis, Charlemagne and Charles V. are to-day but the shadows of names once great. They were denounced by their

⁷ Euloge sen Daniel O'Connell.

opponents, deified by their upholders. The Church knew them to be but men, whose ideas were no more to be woven into the texture of the creed than any of the passing phrases of the world's progress. For the Church, as Pope Pius X. has announced to the Sillonists, is bound to no political or social system. She is neither monarchic nor aristocratic nor democratic, but theocratic, though it may well be that democracy, aristocracy, monarchy, all need her help for their efficient working. Certain it is that the people's rule—if it is to be just and fair—must be based on Christian morals, of which the Church is the great guardian.

She is bound to no old, outworn system. As Leo XIII. wrote in one of his pastorals as a young Bishop: "The Church is tied to no dead thing, save to the corpse that hangs on Calvary." But she is neither to be identified with any passing human organization, for she is greater than all. She denounced modern liberalism in the sixties, when it endeavored to base itself on unbelief; she denounces Socialism so long as it denies the individual right to private property. Yet as pure economic solutions of modern conditions she has not one word to say either to one or to the other. She sits in judgment on them so long as it is a question of moral justice or injustice, but when the debate has turned political she leaves her children to work out the problem by the light of their own consciences.

There has always been in each crisis of the Church's history this constant pressura gentium. It has meant for a while trouble and storm, then, when the elements have settled and there is calm, the Church finds the new conditions quite as favorable, often more favorable than the old. So was it in her struggle with the Gentiles, with the Northern races bursting from the officina gentium (Jordandés), with the Renaissance in all its absolutist tyranny. So will it be with the new democracy in its socialistic dress. For the Church is in no way effete. She can breast the floods to-day with the same vehemence as she has breasted them of old. She is not failing or in decay, for she is only in her teens. She has not yet come of age in centuries. Even when Socialism shall have grown retrograde and a new theory have come into the field, the Church will be found at her old work of baptizing into Christ each movement of the world. She alone will be found unafraid "of the divine sunstroke that threatens the road to Damascus."

BEDE JARRETT, O. P.

London, England.

⁸ Tablet, Vol. 116, No. 3,670, September 10, 1910, p. 405.

IRELAND ERE THE DAWN OF HISTORY.

ONG before the huts of Rome had turned to marble and its rough pillars to towering columns; long before the Comitium laws had begun to be passed for more than a pastoral people whose herds dotted the still green Seven Hills, dim, shadowy colonies flitted like moths round our Western isle, landed, lived, fought and faded in the twilight of time, leaving a few facts of history to be filtered from an ocean of romance.

When mighty monarchs giving names to misty, long-forgotten dynasties reigned in the cradle lands of the human race, man had touched and trodden on the soil of Ireland and sounded its deep forests with curious awe.

Romance, ever busy leavening the measure of fact till no fact remains, sends visitors to our wintry isle from the burning sands and eternal summer of Assyria and Phœnicia centuries before the flood. The most interesting of these antediluvian wanderers was Ceasar, daughter of Bith, whose story, related in something of the "green glasses" style, runs sadly thus: When Noah was constructing the Ark and warning the world of its approaching destruction, Bith and his daughter grew fearful and applied to the patriarch for apartments in the ship, which request the latter was unable to grant. Thus repulsed, Bith and his family had recourse to an idol, which gave them the very rational advice to build a boat themselves and embark. This they did, and Ceasar, with her husband and some others, committed themselves to the mercy of the waves. After seven years they landed on the western coast of Ireland, but as their arrival took place precisely forty days before the Deluge, as might be expected, their sojourn in the island was neither prolonged nor eventful.1

Ireland from its situation has been identified with Ogygia, where the nymph Calypso endeavored by her blandishments to persuade Ulysses to remain and forget Penelope, with her never-ending tapestry, and his own home in Ithaca.² It is mentioned by Orpheus, a writer of the sixth century before Christ, as one of the islands on which the fabled Argonauts touched.³

It would be as absurd to waste time in recounting or discussing all the legends which have risen up around this early period of Ireland's existence as it would be to discuss the rival merits, with regard to history, of Sinbad the Sailor and Rip Van Winkle. This

¹ Keating, Hist, of Ireland, Vol. I., p. 30.

²⁻³ Dalton, Historical Sketch of Irish Antiquities, Royal Irish Academy, 1830, Vol. XVI., Part II., p. 27.

flotsam of legend which has gathered on the sea of time can be left untouched to gratify the poetic and curious who try to piece together and elaborate our bardic annals. The early annalists of our country in trying to connect link by link the limits of our history with the existence of the first inhabitant of the globe threw the chain far out into the darkness, and we have always failed to draw it safely back again.

The prevailing idea of reaching the first root of each genealogical tree necessitated the filling up of hiatuses with imaginary names and gave to our early history the aspect of an epic of romance and distorted fact.

Even in those colonies which the common consent of history admits to the dignity of consideration there is no chronological coherence, and, after a heartbreaking wading through figures and periods, most chroniclers have either arranged the dates according to their own fancy or on the doubtful authority of some ancient poems. They count infallibly from the Deluge, and centuries and years become kaleidoscopically jumbled and come out delightfully intricate and puzzling.

The wisest amongst them were contented with a humble confession of impotence, and as this seems the safest course to adopt, we shall not stop to discuss chronological tables so extravagantly strained and contorted.

When the waters of the flood—so romance gravely narrates—had abated and the earth was dry for one hundred and forty years, and when the Tower of Babel was still spoken of by its living builders, we have the first account of human footsteps in Ireland. A messenger named Athna, sent by Nion, some early explorer, to examine the soil of Ireland, returned to his master with a handful of grass and called the land "the woody isle." His master did not remain, however, to colonize his discovery, but passed on and left the lonely isle to the care of its irrational population, which roamed about unacquainted with the form of man. Thus the ancient poems—the early chroniclers—and among later ones Keating.

These halcyon days of the brute creation lasted for almost two centuries longer, till a parracide, Parthalon, fleeing from Greece, found refuge here. In spite of the distance of time which separates this wanderer—whom, however, modern criticism is inclined to dismiss as no more than a name—from us, old chroniclers are amusingly exact in describing his arrival and stay in the island. If there was any foundation for the elaborate and detailed account which they treat us to, it certainly was microscopic enough to justify one's doubting its reality, since critical history admits the

⁴ Keating, Hist. of Ireland, Vol. I., p. 38.

impossibility of accepting even the existence of the Greek murderer. Nevertheless, we find related with surprising minuteness the names, statistics, etc., of these old world fugitives and have a pedigree tracing Parthalon's ancestry back to Magog, son of Japhet, and great father of the Scythian race.

However, granting that Parthalon did come, the reasons for his coming do not reflect credit on his character, and it is, perhaps, not unfortunate that, in spite of his recommendation on the score of antiquity, circumstances prevented him from becoming the progenitor of the Irish race. He came from Greece, and the occasion of his exchanging its luxurious softness of climate for the stormy uncertainty of the outpost of the Western world was an attempt to obtain the crown of his native country, culminating in the murder of his father and mother. Failing in his design, like another Cain, he took his people, to the number of about one thousand, and fled from the sight of man. Steering past Sicily and the Pillars of Hercules, fortune drove the wind-tossed fugitives out into the Western Ocean, on to the shores of Munster, where they landed at a place called Inbher Sceine. They disembarked on Wednesday, the 4th of May. Note the precision!—day and date called back out of the darkness of prehistoric night by the untiring energy or fertile imagination of our annalists. Parthalon's attendants were his wife and three sons, with their wives and one thousand soldiers. Fearing to pierce the thick, mysterious woods which covered their newly found home, they probably reëmbarked, as we read that the regal residence was fixed at Inish Samer (Ballyshannon), which was some distance from the place of their original landing. Inish Samer means the island of Samer—the name of a greyhound that met its death here under tragic circumstances, which the chronicler does not disdain minutely to relate. Clipped of its poetic plumage, the story tells that the wife of Parthalon was faithless to him, and when called upon to account for her guilty action, instead of showing penitence and remorse, she shamelessly defended her conduct, whereupon her husband, in a fit of resentment, seized her favorite hound, Samer, and dashed it to pieces against the ground. It is the first instance of jealousy and female inconstancy in Ireland: it commenced early, and, as seven bitter centuries stand to prove. we cannot forget that it was unfortunately not the last.5

During the lifetime of the Greek colonist and his posterity in the island seven lakes broke out, one of which sprung from the grave that they were digging for Leighline, one of the chieftain's sons. Thirty years after his arrival Parthalon died, and some centuries later his entire people perished of a plague which carried

⁵ Keating, Hist. of Ireland, p. 41.

off nine thousand in one week on the plains of Howth, near Dublin. The colony seems, in process of time, to have abandoned their Donegal settlement, en masse, and sought some point nearer to their distant Eastern home. The memory of this unanimous exit is said to be preserved in the name of Tallaght, "the plague monument."

Haverty remarks that this first distemper was caused by the corrupting bodies of the Formorians—enterprising gentlemen of whom more anon.⁷

The kingdom was divided on Parthalon's death between his four sons. An old poet observes that—mirabile dictu—and in spite of their father's bad example, the four princes lived in perfect friendship and fraternal unity—a convincing proof, perhaps, that the whole colony perished and had no connection with the subsequent Irish race.

Again—for the last time—the heavy stillness of death lay on the land until one morning's sun revealed the white-sailed ships of Nemedius hovering cautiously near our shores. He landed, and Ireland slept in peace no more. No longer monarch of a desert kingdom, the savage wolf withdrew into its woody fortress and learned to fear a stronger power than itself. The world had now passed its infant stage, and large, accessible tracts of land no longer remained undiscovered or unoccupied.

Yet modern historical critics plead the impossibility of grasping a tangible form behind the shadowy name of this second colonist and throw the beginnings of our history into later times.

Nemedius, like his predecessor, was descended from Magog and was also of the Scythian race. There is an impossible legend that he came as heir to Parthalon to take possession of Ireland on that chieftain's death. From the same ancestor descended the Firbolgs, De Danaans and Gadelians, and although these tribes were dispersed in as many different lands, they still preserved their original Gaelic tongue; a fact which—if it be a fact—seems strange, considering the absence of a written language and the tendency to change which characterized the early dialects after the dispersion of Babel.

Nemedius looms out of the thick fogs of the Euxine with his fleet of thirty ships and one thousand followers, while yet the dark waters which washed the strange shores of Colchis retained their romantic mystery of the polished Greek. He also brought four sons, from one of whom were descended the Firbolgs, a colony which possessed Ireland at a later period. During his stay in the

⁶ Keating, Haverty, Hist. of Ireland. Joyce, Irish Names of Places, I., 161. Four Masters, A. M. 2,820.

⁷ Haverty, Hist. of Ireland, p. 2.

island several other lakes and rivers made their appearance, amongst which we recognize the names of Ennel and Deravaragh, in Westmeath; the others cannot be identified with certainty. One can imagine the painful anxiety of these old colonists seeing their few plains turned into lakes and their humble villages into miniature replicas of Venice or Stockholm.

Twelve years after the advent of Nemedius, Macha, his wife, being gathered to her fathers, bequeathed a name and a tomb to Armagh.⁸

In spite of the paucity of the human race at this time and the lands crying aloud for occupation, our visitors were not long permitted to enjoy their new home in peace and had many stiff conflicts with pirates, whose nomadic instincts rendered a settled life of industry distasteful and who recognized in the little colony an inviting prey.

These freebooters were generally called Formorians, a name translated by some as sea-robber and by others as marine sovereign; but perhaps there was little distinction between these titles at an age when notions of law and duty were ill defined. As others were monarchs on land, why could they not be kings on sea, although

They sank a few more ships, 'tis true, Than a well-bred monarch ought to do?

They were the descendants of Shem and lived in Africa, from whence they fled, fearing to become, by cohabitation, involved in the effects of the curse which Noah had bequeathed to his second son. They were the scourge of the Nemedians and form no inappropriate prototype of the Norsemen or Danes in the ceaseless repetition of history. This resemblance has been urged as a reason for discrediting their existence; it being asserted that the annalists did actually mean the Norse invaders of a later century.

Flashing across the primitive stage of Irish history, they vanish in the gloom, leaving a confused tangle of Nemedians and Firbolgs in their train. Their existence is so feebly supported by authority that, in general, modern authorities deny that such a people lived.

Nevertheless, their wars were sometimes punctuated by agreements, and the pirates often stooped to honest labor. Four Formorian builders were employed by Nemedius to erect two palaces, and on the day on which they were completed the jealous old king took pains to prevent any buildings outshining his own in magnificence by ordering the architects to be put to death. It was a con-

⁸ Keating, Hist. of Ireland, p. 51.

 $^{^{9}\,\}mathrm{Flaherty},$ in his "Ogygia" (I., 18), maintains that the Formorians were Northmen.

venient if primitive way of showing his appreciation for their labors, which method was, perhaps, also strongly recommended by its economy.

Ireland at this time was still almost completely covered by woods, and the king's next consideration was to remove some of these, in order to enlarge the existing clear spaces. He was engaged in these works of general utility when the arrival of the pirates gave him pause.

Our bardic chroniclers relate that when the marauders arrived Nemedius successfully opposed them in three battles, but in the fourth engagement, in Leinster, the old chieftain was defeated and died soon after of broken heart, on the island of Barrymore, near Cork. When this bulwark had been disposed of, the wretched inhabitants were left at the mercy of the Africans, who commenced systematically reducing them to slavery and revenging their losses in the first three battles. More and Conuing were the commanders of the invaders.

The existence of taxation to support a large military and naval establishment gives something of a modern coloring to the transactions of these spectres of the past, for our historians relate that on the 1st of November each year the early possessors of the land were compelled to march up with two-thirds of their children for slavery and two-thirds of their cattle and milk.¹⁰

A female tax collector was employed by the conquerors, and as she was not noted for the softer feminine qualities of pity and kindness, the place where she extracted the involuntary contributions received the sinister appellation of the "field of violence or compulsion." Naturally, such a state of things did not bear the stamp of perpetuity and was doomed to, at least, mutation.

The oppressed Nemedians united under three generals with a force of 30,000 fighting men—where they came from is a puzzle—on land and a similar number on sea. In the first engagement fortune favored them, and Conuing, one of their tyrannical oppressors, was defeated and slain; but the pursuing victors encountered the ill-omened ships of Morc on the coast at Tor Inish¹¹ and the contest was renewed on the shore. The combatants strove until the advancing tide had converted the battlefield into an island and cut off all retreat, so that those who escaped the sword perished in the waves. The ships of Morc proved useful, and the luckless Nemedians again went under. Three of their officers fled to Greece, one of whom was Simon Breac, the leader of the Firbolgs.

Once more the female tax collector resumed her invidious func-

¹⁰ Keating, Hist. of Ireland, p. 55; Haverty, His. of Ireland, p. 5.

¹¹ Opposite Tory Island (Tor Inish).

tions, and the inhabitants sunk into a lethargic despair, the consequences of shattered hope, from which the arrival of the Firbolgs finally aroused them.

This, the third colony, came also from Greece, whither fleeing to escape the Formorian oppression they had exchanged Scylla for Charybdis and found tax masters in whom "the quality of mercy was not strained." The name "Firbolg," comprised from the words "fear," a man, and "bolg," a bag, and meaning "bagman," was a souvenir of their servitude and derived its origin from the labor at which their Attic masters employed them, namely, to fill sacks with clay and carry them to the summits of the barren mountains of Greece to prepare the soil for building purposes.¹²-¹³

The slaves soon tired of this monotonous and unenviable state of existence, and one night, as a result of preconcerted arrangement, their chieftains seized the Grecian shipping, and embarking with their families, enrolled themselves in the more merciful service of Neptune. Slaigne, one of these leaders, is still recorded in the name of the River Slaney, in Wexford, at the mouth of which he landed.

Under the first two colonies the designation of the island was merely an eponym, but the Firbolgs called their new land "Inis Alga," or the "noble island." Eight monarchs, covering a space of fifty-six years, furnish us with our first regular dynasty. Eochy, the last of these, might be styled the Firbolg Justinian, as chroniclers attribute to him the earliest code of laws that flourished in the island. Some of the most extravagant of these chroniclers—with an eye for the appropriate—place Eochy exactly contemporary with Minos, the celebrated legislator, whose probity and love of justice merited for him a judgment seat in the sable world. From the wife of this last Firbolg prince, Tailte, we have the name Tailtean, afterwards famous for its fair (now Teltown, in the County Meath.) 14

After the Firbolgs we come to a people whose mysterious and romantic characteristics seem to modern writers an infallible indication of their imaginary being. Their deeds and exploits render them fit denizens of the shadowy age which tradition assigns to them, and in comparison with them their predecessors seem commonplace and real. This people was the Tuatha de Danaan, who conquered the island during the reign of Eochy. They formed the posterity of the third son of Nemedius, and, like the other colonies, hailed from Greece. They came from Achaia or from

¹² MacFirliss, Tract on the Firbolgs.

¹³ Keating, Hist. of Ireland, p. 58.

¹⁴ Flaherty, Ogygia, III., 9.

near the city of Athens, where they had learned those little necromantic tricks which they practiced with such signal success on the old folks at home when they landed in Ireland.

Among their other accomplishments they possessed that of raising the dead—rather substantially, too, and not merely in appearance, as their story shows. Their departure from the land of their adoption was in connection with this dead-raising department of science. We may here observe, en passant, that it seems strange that a race which possessed the phœnix-like ability of raising its dead and so renewing itself should have perished even more completely than the thicker-headed Firbolgs. But poetry is ready with the answer that the Tuatha de Danaan all became fairies and, of course, live on.

During a war between Assyria and Athens, the former country, then at the height of its power (in agreement with the imaginary chronology), invaded Greece with an overwhelming army. The De Danaan threw in their lot with their Grecian friends, and their practice of resuscitating the departed came in uncommonly useful after the battles, so much so that the Easterns commenced to despair of a task which would have floored Sisypus and of which there could be but one inevitable result. It is somewhat discouraging to encounter the men one killed in yesterday's battle in the fight of to-day.

The Assyrians, accordingly, took counsel with a learned Druid to defeat the skill of the enchanters. The recipe suggested by the sage was that they should stick a stake of wood into the bodies of the slain Athenians after the battle. Filled with courage at the simple remedy and the prospect of putting an end to their perpetual-motion problem, the Easterns attacked and routed their enemies. After the battle they followed the Druid's advice and succeeded in outwitting the necromancers. The latter, consulting for their own safety, now that the superior strength of the invaders must eventually prevail, quietly decamped under Nuadha of the Silver Hand, and left their allies to their own resources.¹⁵

At first they sailed to Scandinavia, where their great learning insured to them a welcome. The Northmen gave four cities—Falias, Finnias, Gorias and Murias—in which to erect schools for the education of the youth of the country, and here our travelers taught with great success. After a short time, however, they shipped for Scotland, where they remained seven years. From Scandinavia they carried away, whether surreptitiously or otherwise history fails to mention, four curiosities of antiquity which played a part of no small importance in the land where they finally settled.

¹⁵ Keating, Hist. of Ireland, p. 67.

The first of these was the Lia Fail, or stone of destiny, which was brought from Falias by the enterprising professor who instructed the population there. This stone had the virtue of being surprisingly disturbed and of emitting a strange thunderlike noise whenever any one of the royal house of Scythia was crowned upon it. It remained in Ireland until the fifth century after Christ, when Feargus, the first king of Scotland, obtained it from the Irish monarch, and it lay in Scone Abbey till Edward I. carried it into England. At present it is supposed to lie in the coronation chair at Westminster, though Dr. Petrie maintained, with little probability, however, that it is still to be identified with the stone which covers the spot called the "Croppie's grave" on Tara Hill.¹⁶

Like the other wonderful things in pagan Ireland, it lost its virtue at the Nativity of our Saviour, when the reign of idols passed away. It is noteworthy that the royal family of the Stuarts, who were descended through Feargus from the Scythian kings, succeeded to the English throne most unexpectedly on account of the virginity of Queen Elizabeth, some centuries after the removal of the Lia Fail from Scotland.

The De Danaan whom fortune had placed in Gorias succeeded in bearing thence a wonderful sword. From Finias came a spear with some surprising qualities, and Murias supplied a cauldron, which, perhaps, proved of some utility on the subsequent voyage.

The Tuatha de Danaan arrived in Ireland in the month of May. and to show that it was their intention to remain, they burned their ships and cut off all retreat. Romance records that their march into the centre of the island was hidden from mortal eves by a thick, diabolically invoked vapor, which enveloped the invaders. History remarks that they probably landed during a fog and had penetrated some distance inland before its dissipation revealed them to the astonished inhabitants. Clio rudely tears asunder what Calliope weaves with so much care! Thus discovered, they sent a challenge to the King Eochy to yield the kingdom or fight for it. Not relishing acquiescent abdication, Eochy fought, but the Tuatha de Danaan employed their magic arts with their accustomed skill and success, and the Firbolgs suffered a defeat, with a loss of 10,000 or, according to others, of 100,000 killed on the field. Judging from these figures, the average Irish family must have been no joke when the world was young.

The fight took place at South Moyturey, near Lough Corrib, called Moyturey of Cong. The Cairn of Eochy, who laid down his life with his crown is still to be seen on the shore near Ballysadare,

¹⁶ Petrie, History and Antiquities of Tara; Keating, Hist. of Ireland, p. 71; Joyce, Ancient Ireland, Vol. I., 45, 278; II., 83.

in the County Sligo, 17 O'Donovan observes that it is a popular belief that the tide can never cover it.18 Thus the island changed owners and the new race held possession for two centuries.

Some historians hold that the Tuatha de Danaan were so called because they were descended from Danaan, a female of the line of Nemedius; but the commoner opinion assigns as the origin of the name their threefold division into tribes. The first of these divisions consisted of the Tuatha, or nobility; the second of Dee, or druids, literally gods; and the third dee Danaan, or poets, Dan signifying "art," also a "poem" or "song."19

Bryan, Juchor and Juchorba—the three sons of Danaan—excelled the others in their magical acquirements, and as with all primitive peoples they owed their apotheosis to their astounding accomplishments. To Ogma, another of the De Danaan, is attributed the invention of Ogham—the simple style of writing which prevailed in most Irish inscriptions till the introduction of Christianity and even afterwards.20 The space of time occupied by the stay of this colony is divided between nine monarchs who constitute our second dynasty. The first of these was Nuadha of the Silver Hand, a valiant champion, round whom a vapor of romantic legend floats, successfully concealing his real character and person, if a real person existed. He was so called from the possession of a silver member which had all the good without the bad qualities of his lost hand. This he lost in the first battle with the Firbolgs, and as its loss constituted a blemish, he was debarred from the government until it could be replaced, the crown being given to Breas of the Formorian tribe. The physician of Nuadha took seven years to affix the metal limb to the royal person, and when it was attached his son endowed it with life, so that Nuadha, luckier than Midas, saw his hand turned to silver without its losing its flexibility or power. Dr. Douglas Hyde in his "Literary History of Ireland" quotes an old poem (having, it need hardly be remarked, little historical value) of which Breas is the hero, or rather villain, as it does not by any means paint a flattering portrait of him. The poet represents the chieftains and princes complaining of the way in which Breas received their visits and the want of regal entertainment which marked the Formorian's palace. No poets, nor jesters, nor jugglers were called out to delight the guests, and worst insult of all, the king was so sparing and economical in his banquets that "the breath of the chieftains did not smell of beer."21

¹⁷ Haverty, Hist. of Ireland, p. 5; Flaherty, Ogygia, III., 9.
18 Note in Four Masters, I., 16.
19 Keating, Hist. of Ireland, p. 76.
20 D. Hyde, Literary Hist. of Ireland, XI., 113.
21 Douglas Hyde, Literary History, XXIII., 284.

When Breas was deposed, as his conduct certainly deserved, he had the great want of politeness to protest and excited a civil war between his friends (the Firbolgs and Formorians) and the De Danaan. In the first battle, which the poem describes in vivid detail, Nuadha was killed by Balor, a Formorian giant, who himself met his death at the hands of Lewy of the long hand, Goliathlike, with a stone from a sling. This fight is known as the battle of North Moyturey.²² In spite of these two crushing defeats, the Firbolgs were by no means exterminated and continued to give trouble occasionally. They dwelt in Connaught, and we read afterwards of an independent king of the Firbolgs named Srang, who reigned contemporaneously with the Tuatha de Danaan.23 Moreover, some Irish families trace their ancestry back to the Firbolgs, and none seem willing to crown their pedigree with a De Danaan name. The latter all became fairies, and Irishmen always preferred a distant to a close connection with such beings.24

The third king was Lewy of the long hand, who instituted the celebrated fair at Teltown, which was held on the 1st of August annually in honor of his foster mother. Dagda More, who succeeded him, was buried on the banks of the Boyne between Slane and Drogheda. Then follow two monarchs of lesser note, and finally we come to the reign of the last three De Danaan kings whose queens gave three names to the island which their husbands governed. These designations, Banba, Eire and Fodhla, tradition has rendered familiar to all. The reason why the name of Eire seems to predominate in its application to Ireland is because when the Milesians landed the husband of Eire reigned.²⁵

These princes governed the land each alternate year, and are known in history by names derived from the different forms of religious worship which they practiced. Thus the first was called MacCuill, because he adored a log of wood. MacCeacht's religious affections centred round a plough, while MacGrain had the sun for his deity. Prosaic history again steps in and suggests that perhaps the first was noted for his tendency to cut down trees, the second for his agricultural propensities and that the last alone might justly be called a son of the sun from his god.

Just one other character deserves mention in connection with the Tuatha de Danaan, namely, Manannan MacLir, King of Mona or Man, who, strangely practical for the romantic age in which he lived, dealt in wholesale merchandise and grew rich as Croesus,

²² O'Rorke, Hist. of Sligo, II., xxx., 260-270.

²³ MacFirliss, Tract on the Firbolgs.

²⁴ Donovan, Four Masters, I., 24.

²⁵ Keating, Hist. of Ireland, 81; Douglas Hyyde, Literary History, V., 48.

while his neighbors chivalrously chopped and sliced each other. He met his death near Lough Corrib probably while engaged enlarging his stock.²⁶ The name MacLir means "Son of the Sea," and O'Donovan remarks that there is a tradition in Derry that the spirit of MacLir lives in an enchanted castle opposite Inishowen and appears riding over the waves every seven years.²⁷

In the reign of the three brothers the Milesians came to the land which they had seen with the mighty telescope from their towers in Spain, and the De Danaan and their memory were swept away like children's sand castles on the beach.

Here our history stops, and though the wanderings of the Gadelians and their sailing "from a land beyond the sea" can in no way be reckoned modern history, yet from their arrival the morning mists are dispelled and we see the sun commence to tint the waves.

Looking back over these old histories one question always suggests itself, and this sketch, slight though it be, would be very incomplete were we to finish it by steering clear of the difficulty. We always ask ourselves, How much of this can be taken for fact and how much must be consigned to the domains of pure fiction? None of us would think of accepting it with the unquestioning faith of children. We first of necessity try to explain away or totally reject the extraordinary and apply historical criteria to what remains, but even after a strict examination so much is fiction intertwined with fact that we find it impossible to draw a definite line of distinction.

In the first place, let it be understood that if we bring testimony in proof of the historical value of these early traditions it is merely a contention for the central facts, such as the existence of the colonies, their sailing hither and perhaps the principal battles, etc. We wash our hands of all dates and chronology and leave the details an open question.

Modern historical criticism grows more skeptical about these early wanderers, and some of the greatest authorities, such as Dr. Douglas Hyde, recognize only in the traditions an Irish mythology and in the characters so many gods. He says: "There is over it all a shadowy sense of vagueness, vastness, uncertainty." And concludes that particularly in the Tuatha de Danaan we are face to face with an Irish Pantheon.²⁸

Dr. Joyce consigns these visitors to the mythological cycle and is inclined to deny the authenticity of the first Milesian kings also. He observes in his "Social History of Ancient Ireland:" "As to

²⁶ Douglas Hyde, Literary History, V., 54.

²⁷ Donovan, Four Masters, III., 532.

²⁸ Literary Hist., XXIV., 293.

the records of the very early kings, they cannot, of course, be received as history, but neither should they be rejected altogether; it is as much a fault to be too skeptical as to be too credulous."29

Nevertheless, in spite of the euhemerism of modern historians, the arguments usually urged in favor of our earliest inhabitants seem pleading.

If we go back into the last centuries and examine the opinions of historians up to the middle of the nineteenth century we shall see that all their attempts were directed to try and reconcile tradition with history and none of them altogether denied some historical foundation to the traditions.

MacGeoghegan sees no reason for doubting the existence of these old colonists, and Keating, lost in a labyrinth of fable and legend and vainly tugging at his Ariadne thread of ancient poetry, goes to great pains to prove that all contrary opinions are mere prejudices. O'Flaherty, Charles O'Conor and others in the eighteenth century held the same opinion about the reality of the early tribes. In the nineteenth century we have O'Donovan and Petrie standing in defense of the existence of our Eastern visitors, and Thomas Moore, though skeptical, thinks that at least the Firbolgs and De Danaan were real personages.³⁰ Later on in the century Haverty in his Irish history wrote: "However they may be enveloped in fable, we have sufficient reason for believing them to be founded on historical fact and that they are not lightly to be set aside when nothing better than conjecture can be substituted."81

The reasons which induced these writers to think that the early inhabitants of our isle were not the shadowy beings that romance would make them seem to be briefly as follows:

First, the great antiquity which the unanimous voice of all historians accords to our island. Camden, whom none will accuse of partiality, remarks: "From the deepest sources of antiquity the history of the Irish is taken, so that in comparison with them that of other nations is but a novelty and a beginning."32 In a poem. "The Argonauts," written about the sixth century before Christ, mention is made of Ireland under the name of Iernis, while Britain is passed over in silence, and it is thought that Ireland was well known to the Phænicians about the time of Homer. For the development of this argument the reader can be referred to Moore's "History of Ireland," where the author brings forward a great number of examples of the knowledge which the earliest peoples had of Ireland, and thus proves the great antiquity of the island.

<sup>Ancient Ireland, v. I., c. III., Part I., 68.
Literary History, V. 47, 48; Dr. Joyce, Irish Place Names,
Haverty, Hist. of Ireland, p. 4.</sup>

³² MacGeoghegan, Hist. of Ireland, note, chap. II., 28 (edition 1844).

Secondly, there is nothing absurd in the assertion that Ireland could have been colonized and well known to travelers while the sister isle remained a deserted and lonely land, though some hold that all the colonies who arrived on the western island passed through England. Moore asserts in proof of their separate colonization the fact that the two countries suffered very different vicissitudes in their early histories. The Romans held military possession of England for four centuries, and in spite of their fearless, enterprising disposition we have every reason to believe that during all that time the presence of a legionary was unknown in the neighboring isle.³³

Granting that the first colonists came from the South, via Spain—and it is historically certain that the Mediterranean and its bordering countries formed the earliest seat of civilization long before venturesome travelers penetrated the forests of Hungary or braved Alpine snows—it is not improbable that ships sailing more or less at random out into the Atlantic Ocean would strike Ireland sooner than England.

In our earliest history we led a separate, independent existence, with little connection with outside lands, and found enough to talk about in our own secluded world.

Thirdly. Although it is admitted that among primitive peoples oral traditions were sometimes transmitted from generation to generation with surprising fidelity and exactness, nevertheless, the breath of time would dim the bright silver of truth and fable and legend usually became intricately intermingled with fact. So it would prove a strong argument against the veracity and reliability of Irish annals if our ancestors could be proved ignorant of a written language. But it seems placed beyond a doubt that long before the coming of St. Patrick a written language flourished and was widely known to the learned men in Ireland, and our only difficulty is in probing the darkness to discover the first appearance of Ogham. Dr. Joyce in several places in his social history and Dr. Douglas Hyde in a special chapter of his "Literary History of Ireland" discuss the antiquity of the Ogham characters.³⁴

Fourthly. Nor does it seem possible to indict the Irish annalists on the charge of carelessness or intentional negligence in their writings, as amongst a host of witnesses for the defense the following examples of accuracy brought forward by Moore, Dr. Joyce and others would sufficiently exculpate them:

The date of an eclipse which took place on the 1st of May in the year 664 A. D. is recorded by an historian, and its truth has

⁸⁸ Moore, Hist. of Ireland, VIII., 164.

³⁴ Literary Hist., XI., 109.

been proved by modern astronomical observation. The Venerable Bede, writing only half a century after the event, mistakes the date and gives the 3d of May. The historian in that age could not have employed scientific means to discover the time of the eclipse and must have had ocular proof of its appearance.³⁵

The account of the high tide in Dublin Bay during the battle of Clontarf is another case where personal experience has been proved by subsequent investigations.

Fifthly. We must confess ourselves baffled in trying to discover the first period in which our country's annals commenced to be recorded.³⁶ The oldest writings that we have make reference to still older manuscripts, and they stretch back indefinitely and beyond recall. That the Irish respected the historical profession and gave all facilities for study, etc., is certain from what we know of our history. Each chieftain considered his rank very inadequately supported if he did not possess amongst his regular retinue an historical writer who chanted the exploits of his lord and his clan.³⁷

Our forefathers were a conservative people and treasured customs in proportion to their antiquity, but we read of no custom which was treasured like the custom of having and supporting bards and historians. Their conservatism is characteristically exemplified by the following story:

About the time of the Christian era King Conor MacNessa, King of Ulster, organized a tournament, at which the greatest knights of Erin contended. Hither came Cuchulain in his seventh year, and despite his tender age his achievements were so astonishing that the King deemed the "enfant terrible" worthy of the accolade and knighted him. Hence came the custom of dubbing the sons of chieftains, princes, etc., knights at the age of seven years. And it remained unchanged until long after the English invasion of Ireland. When Prince John, after plucking the beards of the princes who came to meet him at Waterford, felt some political remorse for his disgraceful conduct, he offered to knight his visitors, but they replied that they had that honor conferred on them in their seventh year. A century later we have the testimony of Froissart that the custom still continued and only gradually disappeared.

Sixthly. There is a remarkable concord and consistency in the old accounts and deviations and differences are only in the details,

37 Ancient Ireland, I., 65 and 528.

³⁵ Literary History, IV., 39; Moore, Hist. of Ireland, VIII., 166; Joyce, Ancient Ireland, Vol. I., Pt. II., XIV., 515.

³⁶ Joyce, Ancient Ireland, I., XV., 531; Literary History, VII., 71.

while all admit the salient points. The historians were always bards also, and if the traditions have come down to us principally in poetry, there is no reason why, when we have successfully or unsuccessfully brushed away the poetic embellishments, that we should not behold some real life happenings. The early Greek poets handed down historical events and personages which were none the less true for their artistic clothing. The fact that they were in poetry rather insured their safe transmission from mouth to mouth in an age when only the very learned could read.

Seventhly. The geographical position of Ireland. This argument for the real existence of our earliest visitors is urged by Petrie and Pinkerton.³⁸ A colony could have lived and perished here unknown to the world and only left internal traces of its life. We can scarcely look to England or any neighboring nation for confirmation of the assertions of our bards, as there is little evidence of relations with foreign lands in our very early history.

Finally, it is customary to adduce the testimony of the historical and topographical remains preserved in our old place names.³⁹ As a parting shot we might remark that several Irish families—at least up to the eighteenth century—claim descent from the Firbolgs.

These are the principal proofs advanced by writers for the reality of the existence of the old Irish colonists; and though modern historical criticism seems to deny their value, nevertheless they cannot be passed over as unworthy of consideration.

As has been stated, the dates and years are an exaggerated monstrosity which would require an elastic credulity to accept, but even this could not directly invalidate the truth of the central facts. Thomas Moore in his history⁴⁰ affirms that the ancient Egyptians boasted of a period of 11,340 years between two kings, Menes and Lethon, and yet the two monarchs truly lived—the hyperbole did not affect the reality.

The Romans had their Romulus and Remus—they believed in them and were proud of them—later ages thought them myths—but modern research tends to show that they lived and modeled the kernel of the empire of the Cæsars. May it not be the same with us? We accept the existence of Greeks and Romans as certain, though the authority is not much stronger than that brought forward by our own historians for our own forefathers.

At any rate, let us treat these old traditions gently and not tear them to shreds by a superficial, prejudiced criticism, for sometimes when with heavy eyes and heavier hearts we pore over the blood

³⁸ Joyce, Ancient Ireland, Vol. I., III., 69.

³⁹ Literary History, V., 47, 48; Dr. Joyce, Irish Place names.

⁴⁰ V. 75.

⁴¹ Lanciani, Rome in the Light of Recent Discovery.

and tear-stained pages of our country's annals and sadly ponder the useless "what might have been" it may lighten our minds to close the dreary volume and turn to the brighter contemplation of "Ireland ere the dawn of history."

SHAUN MACSHANE.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF LITERATURE.

HE aim proposed in this article is to find and establish those rules of writing, to follow which gives, ceteris paribus, Literature. Looked at from another point of view, its aim may be said to propose a complete philosophic explanation of all the precepts commonly given in text-books and manuals. Again, it may be looked on as furnishing an entire code of criticism, a solid rock always to be relied on and fallen back on in every emergency.

With these remarks we start immediately on our subject by laying down a definition of Literature, and say it is the beautiful expression of thought by speech. This definition will immediately be seen to divide itself up into two parts, one general—"the beautiful expression of thought"—this is art; and one particular "by speech," by which Literature is differentiated from the other arts, e. g., statuary, the expression of an ideal by carving, etc. The first part is still further divided up into the two notions, of Beauty, and of the expression of thought, by which art is differentiated from that other manifestation of beauty—nature.

These three notions we shall take up in turn, beginning with the more general, Beauty, and descending to Art and Speech. In all this discussion we must bear in mind that we are not studying each idea in and for itself, but solely as each is an element of the definition of literature. With this caution we briefly proceed.

I. BEAUTY.

It seems strange that while nothing is so common, we might say, as beauty, such great difficulty should be experienced in defining it. Because of the number and variety of beautiful objects, because of frequent disagreements as to what is beautiful, attempts at classification, and still more at definition, have usually proved futile; then, too, where some have succeeded, they have only partially succeeded; they touch only one side of the question, they give only snapshots from one standpoint.

We shall try not to imitate this latter process, and shall present the subject under all its aspects, with the assurance that it is only in uniting all the points of view that the true definition can be found.

The whole question, then, naturally falls into two grand divisions, the beautiful, its nature and effects on us; this is the science of æsthetics proper; and the applications and realizations of Beauty; this is Art. Putting aside for the moment the latter, let us take the former division. Immediately it, in its turn, falls into two considerations; that of the nature of beauty, its objective side; that of its effects on us, the subjective side. Of these, the first completes the second, and gives us our whole looked-for theory.

I. First of all, everybody will admit that the feeling evoked in us by beauty is one of pleasure. In a very general way, then, the æsthetic emotion is a pleasure. We are now sure that we have an idea that contains the notion we seek; we will gradually draw it in closer until we have caught just the precise definition needed. The æsthetic emotion is a pleasure, but not every pleasure is the æsthetic emotion; far from it. We must first discover, then, what kind of a pleasure it is. First, however, what is pleasure?

God, in creating man, put into him an irresistible need of action. In its last analysis, this need of action is his tendency towards perfection. Now, the satisfaction of this need we call by the name of happiness, and when this happiness is incomplete and limited to the satisfaction of some one particular desire it is called pleasure.

What, then, is pleasure? It is the "repose" of a faculty in the object it pursues. Now, for a faculty to repose in its object, far from meaning cessation from action, means the fullest and completest activity. But "the maximum of activity must be obtained with a minimum of fatigue." The faculty gives full play to all its forces in possessing its object, and it has its pleasure in accomplishing its end—to act.

But are we going to admit that every pleasure resulting from the full activity of every faculty is æsthetic pleasure? No; it is clear at the first glance. For, first of all, the activity of every faculty does not give æsthetic pleasure; nor does every activity of the faculties that are concerned here give it, either. As to the first point: We are forced, before all, to establish with what faculties the pleasure of beauty is concerned and with what it is not, and say at once, it is only concerned with the cognitive faculties, the senses of sight and hearing, the understanding, the reason.

This is proved by experience. We do not say we have had beau-

¹ Aristotle, Ethics, Lib. x., c. iv., and Maher, Psychology, p. 222.

² Rabier, E., Leçons de Philosophie, II., p. 633, and De Smedt, Essai de Phil. de Literature.

tiful exercise, or "a beautiful smell," or that chocolates have a beautiful taste. That only is beautiful which has to do with knowledge, that is clear. The pleasure is an intellectual one. St. Thomas sums this up very well. "It is of the nature of beauty," he says, "to satisfy the appetites by its mere aspect, or the mere knowledge of it; hence only those senses are concerned with beauty that are especially cognitive. Besides, we do not call odors and tastes beautiful," etc.

So, then, it is only within the range of the pleasures of the cognitive faculties that æsthetic pleasure lies. But once again, the two pleasures are not identical, i. e., every faculty activity is not an æsthetic activity, for here we are led to distinguish two more shades of thought. According to the aim sought, every activity is either interested or disinterested. It is the distinction between work and play. To take an example. We are examining, say, the theory of Probabilism. We do so to settle a case of conscience, and we are said to be "interested." We do it merely for the sake of doing so, and we are disinterested. In the latter case the pleasure the faculties give us by being put in full action is æsthetic. We divert all our forces to the immediate object of seeking the answer, but we take a pleasure, nevertheless, and the pleasure is æsthetic.

To sum up, we can, then, say in a general manner that when the activity is cognitive, and that disinterested, its satisfaction gives æsthetic pleasure. This is a considerable modification of the definition we started out with, but one careful process of elimination assures us it is the right one. All the ideas it contains are also clear, and the reader is in a position to grasp this first step in our march toward the definition of beauty.

2. But it is only a first step. It has indeed been placed as the sole definition obtainable of beauty by Kant, Schiller and many modern English æsthetes;⁵ indeed, all whose subjectivist tendencies force them to it.

Their position is plain. Taking for granted that there is no such thing as objective beauty, they give as its definition all that provokes this disinterested faculty-play. We will go one step towards the other extreme, taking our place in the middle—always the safe place. Admitting beauty to be in great part determined by the subject—his circumstances, frame of mind, etc.—we can at least say in a more defined way what it is objectively.

It is plain that the theory thus far developed explains only half of the problem. Why is the faculty satisfied? What and of what

³ Summa, 1, 2ae. 27. 1, ad 3.

⁴ Rabier, ibid, 632, 507.

⁵ G. Sortais, Traité de philosophie, Vol. II., p. 698.

nature is the object in which it "reposes?" You will say everything that causes it disinterested satisfaction. But that is a circle, and circles are not satisfying. Why does it cause satisfaction? That is the question we must face and set ourselves to answer.

The answer is plain enough.

The æsthetic emotion is primarily concerned with the mind. Looked at in this light, the need of action we have spoken of becomes a need to know. Our mind is made to know, as an animal is made to eat and sleep, and as a knife is made to cut and a gun to shoot. That is its end, and it results from its nature and the nature of things. Now, once that need is satisfied, it reposes there, it has enough for the present with the object it has found. And if its activity has been "æsthetic," in the sense we have defined, the resultant pleasure is æsthetic, and the object, we know, must be beautiful. But what is the object? That is precisely the question. What is it that makes it beautiful? What, too, is this need of the mind? What is the mind made to know?

Metaphysicians answer by one word, "Being." In Latin they call it "ens" and the French call it "être," both of which words are ever so much more expressive than our own. But however unsatisfactory the word, the idea is of the commonest, as are most of the ideas metaphysicians set themselves to define.

When we say the mind is made to know, and to know being, we only say it seeks the reality, i. e., that which is. It thirsts for contact with what is, and for nothing else under the sun; for the very simple reason, perhaps, that there is nothing else under the sun, or beyond it, than that which is. But in this particular case we mean also to say that it seeks it under precisely this aspect, as being. The range of our mind is infinite; everything that is is knowable, and as such capable of satisfying our mind. Now, we gather up from all sides this idea of being and set it up in one grand transcendental quality of all things, and we say the "Supreme Being," that in which there is nothing but being is God. In us there are many contradictions, much that is unintelligible, i. e., much that is non-being, much imperfection. In God there is naught such; all is perfection and that perfection is to be. And we say, moreover, that a thing has "more being" in proportion as it approaches the Supreme Being—if we can be said to approach the infinite. A thing has more being as it is more perfect, more real, more Godlike. An animal has more being than a plant, and man more than an animal, and so on.

These ideas once well defined, we can go on. Our way is now clear. The mind is made to know, to know being. It thirsts after being. By being, by the reality, by that which is, it is satisfied.

Its full activities are set in motion, in one grand sweeping act, by being—and that, for it, is pleasure. And what gives it pleasure? Being. Therefore, beauty is nothing else than—Being. And a thing is more beautiful in proportion as it has more being, as it accomplishes more in itself its eternal type in the Supreme Being above and comprehending all.

Objectively, then, the Beautiful is nothing else than Being,⁶ the end and aim of all intellectual activity. It may be called the Plenitude of Being,⁷ because a thing is more beautiful in proportion as it has more being. So a poem, a landscape, a painting please the more they show the mind of what the mind delights in.

But beauty is far from being completely that, as far indeed from that as it is far from being something merely subjective. What is it, then? The both together. This is the point, then, to be brought here. The two parts of this theory cannot be separated; one completes the other, either is incomplete alone. "Being" satisfies the cognitive faculties and so gives them pleasure, yes; but it is only on condition that their activity is a disinterested one, that there is æsthetic pleasure; and consequently beauty connoted in the object.

These are the two determining conditions of beauty. One completes the other, and together they form the definition of the Beautiful. "Whenever a thing appears to us exactly as it ought to be, possessing all possible good qualities, corresponding to a definite ideal and realizing the type of its species, it astonishes us, charms us; we gather from it an æsthetic impression." Granted; but only on condition that it is perceived by a faculty at play, acting disinterestedly. We take little pleasure in a problem of mathematics if in view of building a house or laying out a garden; but we might were we working out the problem for the mere sake of doing it.

A very important proof of this, and one that will recur frequently, is this: Beauty pleases by its form, not its matter. In the interested activity we seek what is, for some good to be got from that; when disinterested or æsthetic, it stops at its exterior dress, which is enough to satisfy its contemplation; it halts and considers the voice or tone of the messenger, and not the grave or gay import of the message. In the latter we make the shell our aim; in the former we push past it to get at the kernel within. "In the presence of a

⁶ This is recognized by more than one—e. g., by Taine, where one would least expect to find it (Philosophie de l'Art, I., 48): "Art is philosophy, metaphysics in a sensible form." Now, the object of all metaphysics is being. And De Wulf (Rev.-Neo-Schol., 1907, p. 492): "Æsthetics is a study of metaphysics, because the object of both is being."

⁷ Ch. Boucaud, L'amour et l'être, Rev. de phil., Jan., 1907, p. 31.

⁸ Paul Sourian, La Beauté Rationelle, p. 113.

⁹ Henri Poincaré (quoted by J. Verest in Manuel de Lit., p. 33).

real hero or a real Tartuffe æsthetic pleasure is not possible, but once the form is separated from the matter and presented in a work of art, play can come in and even the fearful be beautiful."¹⁰ In this discursive faculty-play the form sought is nothing in the concrete but the realization of the Divine ideal type. And we shall see later on how Beauty is sought because at its base lies Divine Beauty Itself. This is a remarkable confirmation of our theory. Another is this: We know that it is the form that gives being to a thing; this is why beauty, which is, after all, being, is in the form. The theory, then, holds closely together.

This, therefore, is our acquisition, the result of our search: Beauty is being—perfection,¹¹ if you will—perceived by the cognitive faculties in the disinterested play of their activity.

This would be the place to go into long explanations of the progress in the perception of beauty, the relativity of beauty, etc., but we shall not do it. We will content ourselves with a few interesting and more concrete applications of the theory before passing on to the second part of this discussion.

First of all, a particular glance at the faculties here concerned, and after that a remark on how beauty is manifested in nature.

That only those faculties which more particularly bring us knowledge are concerned is clear. These faculties are twofold, sensible and spiritual. Of the senses, only the so-called superior ones, sight and hearing, can perceive beauty.¹² The taste, etc., are not æsthetic because they are inseparably connected with the preservation of life, i. e., all their activity is interested; and this is why we say the taste of meat is good, not beautiful. In other words, the form is inseparable from the matter in this case, and so the faculty cannot dwell on it alone.¹³

For the same reason the higher senses are æsthetic. They can abstract from the form, dwell on it, admire it, contemplate it. If we examine the particular cases, everywhere we see the general law confirmed. In the words of Spenser: "Beautiful sounds are those that cause the greatest pleasure." And Aristotle: "That there is a pleasure in every act of the perceptive faculty is plain, for we say sights and sounds are pleasant. Those sounds are beautiful that set the ear faculty in pleasant and harmonious motion.

Again, the eye sees colors and forms. Here again every activity means pleasure, and the higher the excitation and the smaller the

¹⁰ Rabier, op. cit., p. 639.

¹¹ As Sourian (op. cit., p. 106), without our addition.

¹² De Smedt, La Théorie du beau, pp. 12-13.

¹³ Rabier, op. cit., p. 635.

¹⁴ Quoted by Rabier, ibid, p. 637.

¹⁵ Ethics, x., 4.

fatigue, the greater the pleasure. Red and orange do not "go well together," because, for physiological reasons, the optic nerve is too violently wrenched in comparing them.¹6 There is no harmonious activity. Again, curved lines are more beautiful than broken ones for the same reason of causing a smoother activity. And movement, the third object of sight, is more beautiful when horizontal than when vertical, because the eye is rested thereby.¹7

The same can be repeated for the higher faculties. All said of the senses is true for the imagination as well, where the same operations are interiorly reported and repeated.¹⁸ For the emotions it is still the same. Sober activity pleases, violent hurts and displeases. Likewise even a theory can be very beautiful, because the intelligence finds there a ground to use disinterestedly its highest activity, to find the truth. And the same for the will. Everywhere the conclusion is the same,¹⁹ the violent activity displeases, and what causes it is hideous, deformed, ugly; while that is pleasant, admirable, beautiful, that provokes a sweet, rich and harmonious activity of the faculty that makes it its object.

Again, take beauty as it is found in nature. Why and in what degree is nature beautiful? All by symbolism, especially in the inorganic world. Indeed, this is the fundamental law of all symbolism. Nature is only beautiful except as it mirrors higher life, first man and then God. The ocean suggests eternity and is beautiful, as is the mountain that recalls majesty and power. So much is this true that the greatest perfection of the inorganic world is to be symbolic of what is higher.²⁰ "Nature is beautiful as it mirrors, realizes, the form, the idea type of the Divine ideal;"²¹ its power to please us is at its highest when it suggests the greatness, nobleness, goodness of God.

A third remark to make explains further the wording of the definition. We said that Beauty is being. Is, then, everything that exists, that has being, beautiful? In what does beauty differ from the object of the intelligence and will, which is also being? A first answer is made by calling attention to the other part of the definition, where the second essential is insisted on, the disinterested activity of the faculties. But another idea may be brought forward that will considerably enlighten the question. It is this: Being can be sought for itself or for some ulterior end. When sought for an end, for the matter, it is good or true according as it strikes the

¹⁶ Grant Allen, Rev. Philosophique, v., 91.

¹⁷ Sully, Rev. Phil., ix., 498.

¹⁸ De Smedt, Essai, etc., p. 16.

¹⁹ Id., ibid, p. 20.

²⁰ Labre, Philosophie, I., 338-339.

²¹ Verest, op.cit., p. 357.

will-passion, love—or the mind—understanding, reason; when it is sought for itself, for its form, it is beautiful in relation to all the faculties. The two extremes are inseparable. Beauty, goodness, truth, exist, inasmuch as they round out a faculty; at bottom they are one.

This seems the proper place to point out that we are not neglecting what is very evidently an important element in the perception of beauty. That is the emotional element. It is true that this enters in greatly, but just as true that it is only secondary. The sensible emotion, the "trembling of the soul," that rises in us at sight of beauty is the aftermath of the thrill our cognitive faculties receive. It runs all along the gamut of our being, starting in the high regions of the mind and ending by reverberating all up and down the profoundest depths of our hearts. It is the deeper echo that follows the higher and clearer call of the mind; deeper, but secondary, nevertheless, in time and importance.

But these fields of thought are poor and barren compared with the grand perspectives that open out before us on taking another point of view.

The reader will have noticed that there is a progress in the perception of beauty, which is nothing else than the natural progress the mind makes in its wider experience. The uncivilized savage is ravished at the sight of an old silk hat; we have gone further in our appreciation. And as there is a progress of nations, so there is one of individuals. Now, what is this progress in its last analysis? We have in us an incontrovertible tendency to an end. Since we are intelligent creatures, this tendency, for our mind, is towards the Supreme Being, the only thing that can satisfy us perfectly, because for that we are made and, in some sort, proportioned. Our experience of beauty is a constant progress towards this end; every time we see something more beautiful we see something nearer the Supreme and Eternal Beauty.²² And the æsthetic emotion we feel at the sight of that is nothing more at bottom than our love—the love of every being-for the Supreme Being whence comes all being, the tendency of every nature towards God.28

Man loves being; there is the motor-force of the universe,²⁴ and this love of beauty, of the fullness of being, is his proper and essential feeling as a man.

Hence we shall be perfectly satisfied with the Beatific Vision,²⁵ because then we shall see Being in its greatest possible fullness,

²² Labre, op. cit., I., 339; De Smedt, Théorie, etc., end.; luis. xili., 1-6.

²⁸ Verest, op. cit., p. 386.

²⁴ Rev. de Phil., l. c.

²⁵ Ibid.

and there and there only the activities of our soul's faculties will be fully occupied and satisfied, because only then shall we have reached our final end. There Being and Love, the sources of all beauty, will be perfectly united. All Beauty comes from God, because a thing is beautiful only as it mirrors God, the Supreme Being, Beauty Itself.²⁶

This is the grand source and well-spring of the spiritual life, for here man is interested in Being for its sake alone. Here his activities are disinterested. Now, the Supremest of Beings is God; hence the march of the saint to God. The saint is the best of artists, says Plato,²⁷ "because he ceaselessly labors to produce in his soul the image of the highest Beauty, Absolute Beauty, God;" and we, seeing more than the pagan, can fill in his words—"because he produces in his soul the Ideal Beauty incarnate, Jesus Christ."²⁸

The essence, then, of the artistic, scientific and mystical lives is one and the same. "The psychology of the philosopher and that of the saint are little different from that of the poet. They are, all three, lovers of Being; the poet suggests its interesting and mysterious problem, the philosopher examines it and the saint resolves it. Art, Science, Religion—they are the three great stages in the soul's grand pursuit of Being."²⁰

Two consequences of this interesting doctrine are worth glancing at. We see now, of course, what is the Ugly. Anybody knows it is the contrary of Beauty. We can go further. God is all Beauty; then, sin which is committed against God is the original ugliness; so a sin against created beauty is what we call the Ugly.³⁰ Then, too, we have here the only true solution of the problem of the Ethics of Art. Sin is essentially ugly. Hence any artist that introduces the immoral into a work of art commits a fatal error; his work is for that very reason not a work of art, because for that very reason essentially ugly. But more of this later.

Besides the essential elements of beauty, there are others that, while not essential, are still conditions of beauty. Though useful, we can do no more than briefly indicate them, believing it useless to dwell on any, especially as they have been so fully developed by many who posit them as definitions. A concise analytic view will suffice.

They naturally fall into two classes—those governing the object and those governing the subject. Now, the object must have a

²⁶ De Smedt, 1. c.; cf. luis. xiii., 1-6.

²⁷ Symposium, 209, A., B.

²⁸ Cf. "Jesus, the All-Beautiful," ch. I. (Burns & Oates).

²⁹ Ch. Boucaud, Rev. de Phil., l. c. p. 36.

³⁰ Verest, op. cit., pp. 357-358.

certain perfection in itself.31 This perfection means first of all proportion and order.³² If considered with regard to itself solely, this order will in its turn be called moderation; that is to say, it will not be beautiful unless it be of a just proportion in itself, not too small nor too large to be perfect in its kind.33 The Jungfray and a violet are beautiful, because they fulfill the perfection of their being. Again, if this proportion or order be considered with regard to its parts or to its surroundings,34 it is called harmony. Harmony of the parts demands two conditions, variety and a unity injected into it. 85 Hence, to be beautiful a thing must realize its ideal type of perfection—both the Objective ideal, the Divine Idea and the Subjective ideal as our idea of the first.36 Then capping all these must be a certain splendor,37 or, in other words, the perfection must not only be there, but be conspicuous, must have force, or "evidence."38 Of course, none of these things make beauty; they are but its conditions, not its definition; a flower, a landscape are not beautiful because they are perfect, proportioned, moderate, harmonious, varied and unified, but when they are all this.

The same remark applies to the two conditions required on the part of the subject. These are, first, that the interior appreciation of the beauty of a picture, a flower, must be made at one blow, one flash of intuition.³⁰ This intuition is followed by an emotion—not a sensation, but an emotion, "the trembling of the *soul*"—that makes the scene or the object seem rich and full to us, and once more sets a-light that love which is at base our love of the All-Beautiful, God. Here, too, must be observed that hierarchy of the faculties that Père Loughaye⁴⁰ puts at the base of all æsthetic emotion. It is that in the activity of the faculties each should have the importance its dignity demands, and no more and no less than that. The imagination, then, and still more the passions, must have no undue predominance over the higher, spiritual faculties, and

⁸¹ S. Thom., I., 398, adds to the conditions proportion and splendor; a third, perfection, embracing both. *Cf.* Sourian, 106.

³² Given as beauty's definition by not a few.

³⁸ So when S. Thomas says "quae diminuta sunt, eo ipso turpia sunt" (I. 39, 8c.), this is what he means.

³⁴ This seems to be Taine's definition of beauty. Cf. Phil. de l'Art.

³⁵ Given as the definition of beauty by P. André (Essai sur le Beau) and Cousin (Du vrai, du bien, du beau, leçon, vii.e). Jouffroy (Cours d'esthétique, leç., 38), with Hegel (Esthetica, I.), gives as definition "the expression of the soul." All these definitions manifestly err from taking one side only of the question. "Non soli et toti conveniunt."

³⁶ This is explained fully in its place. Cf. p. 24.

³⁷ Verest (op. cit., p. 36) calls beauty "la splendeur du vrai."

⁸⁸ As Sourian, op. cit., p. 115.

³⁹ Rabier, op. cit., pp. 624-625, and Mercier, Ontologie, pp. 503, 572.

⁴⁰ Théorie des Belles-Lettres, pp. 9, 19, 27.

any artist who persists in breaking this hierarchy commits a fundamental sin against art and prepares the way to intellectual anarchy.

2. ART.

It is now time to pass to the second consideration, to take the second step in this inquiry into the nature of Literature. We have built up one element thereof; we now lay on it the first materials of the second. We have said Literature is one species of art; that art, which expresses itself by speech; just as sculpture is expression by carving, and so on. More of that later. Art we have defined as the beautiful expression of thought. What beauty is we know. Let us now see its place in the natural expression of man's thought.

The nature of the work of art—what makes it art—and its production; these are the two subjects of our inquiry.

Most people give for the aim of art the realization of the beautiful in the concrete, and as an ulterior aim, arousing æsthetic pleasure. Our definition can agree with this, and vet go one step further. For on what condition is a thing beautiful? That it shows us more "being." And on what condition will the fullness of being rouse æsthetic pleasure? That it be perceived with an æsthetic activity. But the æsthetic activity only concerns itself with the form in the beautiful object. Hence in art what causes æsthetic pleasure is the form. Now, in art the form is the expression, and so the essential foundation of art is the form of a thing, or beautiful expression. Therefore, the real end of art, given as the expression of beauty, becomes the beautiful expression of our thought; that is to say, that which is beautiful in art is the form, the expression; art's aim, which is to produce beauty, does so in the expression. The expression is beautiful, not necessarily the thought expressed. This follows from all that has been said.

The same idea can be brought out by looking at the question from another viewpoint. In art two distinct periods are recognized, conception and execution. In the former the elements are disposed, the *matter* is prepared. That, man cannot create, neither can he make it beautiful. It will be so in proportion as he penetrates further into the inner recesses of the mystery of being, but even there he must take it as he finds it; and some men find more, some less. But what man can create is the form. In the execution of his idea he can put more or less beauty. This is why the artist can make the ugly beautiful; the matter may be ugly, but the form is beautiful, and it is precisely inasmuch as he can do this that a man is an artist. So the inside of a peasant's hut can become beautiful on the canvas of a Teniers, and the man who can do this we call an artist.

It must be remarked here that we draw a sharp distinction between expression and execution The expression of an ideal, the form we mean to give it, is made before any concrete manifestation appears, i. e., before the ideal is realized, executed. It is the confusion of these two ideas that led to the false definition of art.

The formula "the expression of beauty" cannot stand for art. Firstly, according to the two infallible tests of a definition, all expression of beauty is not art—it might be badly expressed, for instance—and again, all art is not the expression of beauty, for sometimes the ugly is expressed in art, and in true art, too. It is made beautiful in the expression, in the form in which it, the matter, is encased. On the other hand, all art is the beautiful expression of thought. A man is an artist because he can express his thought, be it the most commonplace, in a beautiful manner, be it in verse or in marble. And all beautiful expression of thought is art, because the form, if beautiful, must infallibly cause æsthetic emotion, which is the universal and general idea of the aim of art.

Again, art work is essentially concrete; abstractions cannot be made the subject of art,⁴² except as concreted; no man ever carved an abstract statue; an idea is realized, and the more beautifully it is realized the greater is the value of the masterpiece. As for the element of thought in the process, we shall examine it further on and see that the idea is not necessarily beautiful, that the beautiful does not enter into the concept of art until we begin to treat of expression.

Now, it is plain to all who think for a moment that a thing is not the same in nature and in art. The violet is not the same in the wood as on the canvas. Wherein precisely does this difference lie? In the fact that art exceeds, surpasses nature, goes beyond her in beauty. Why is this? Their ends differ; nature looks to have all things useful and good; art prescinds from this and looks to make an ideal world as beautiful as possible, and concentrates all her efforts to that. She is not bound down to all that nature is. In art the reality of the object disappears; the form alone remains. Now, in nature all that is ugly, disagreeable, contradictory, comes from the matter. Once eliminate that and the æsthetic activity finds nothing to hinder it, nothing to jar on it, since all the jarring elements are the material ones. It is Matter that displeases—i. e., imperfection, etc.—and it is by hypothesis absent in art. In nature, however, it is of necessity always present, painfully so, we might even say. This is why nature is surpassed by art; this at the same time affords a further insight into the nature of art.

⁴¹ By "conversion." "Soli et toti definito convenire debet."

⁴² Verest, op. cit., p. 346.

A further one is seen in a most beautiful and interesting comparison that might be made between the Divine Creation and the production of a work of art.⁴³ It is an extremely true one and might be carried very far. We shall sketch an outline or two.

In creation there is both beauty and use; we seek things for themselves or in an interested aim. Art takes only one of these to produce a beautiful object only, to give food only to a disinterested faculty. In God's works this food is furnished by the form, as we have seen; this is the element the artist takes from it. Again, God sees all things in Himself, in His own Infinite Essence; He sees there the idea-type, the exemplary cause; these, then, He, by an act of His will, realizes, and creation is accomplished. So does the artist see the objects of his creation, not indeed in his essence—but on the curtain of his mind; and in realizing them he produces a work of art. God's work is "to His own image and likeness." So is the artist's; his work bears his own character stamped on it; it is as he sees it; he cannot keep himself out of it, however "objective" his work may be. This is what Bacon means when he says: "Ars, homo additus naturæ." "So artistic masterpieces are signs and symbols of the human ideal, just as created beings are signs and symbols of the Divine Thought."44 And Father Faber says: "Creatures are God's works of art, His special ideas, His music, His poem."45 So when St. John says: "In the beginning was the Word," he is speaking of this Eternal expression of God to himself of His Divine Eternal Thought; just so, in a manner transcendentally inferior, the artist expresses his thought by the "inner word" (verbum interius) long before he ever touches pen to paper or chisel to the block of marble. Many other resemblances could be brought out, resemblances, but, be it noted, infinitely different in degree and nature; let these suffice.

We can say, then, in summing up, that the fundamental principle of art is to equal the actual execution to the idea preconceived, that beauty enters into art inasmuch as the matter is clothed in a beautiful expression, that this "expression" is already made before the actual execution; that the aim of art is to cause æsthetic pleasure by a concrete work, and that this is done by the beautiful expression of a thought—idea or emotion—of the artist. The value and perfection of a work of art is in proportion to the conformity of the execution to the idea; its beauty is in its form.

2. Let us now take up the two elements in art—the two factors

446

⁴³ It is developed at length in Rev. de Phil. (1903, p. 392, et seq.), Art et Science, by G. Sortais.

⁴⁴ Ibid, p. 392.

⁴⁵ Bethlehem.

that compose its nature—and look at each in concrete detail, that is, in reference to the actual production of a work of art. In every process of art there are two distinct periods, that of conception and that of execution. In the whole operation of producing a finished masterpiece these may intermingle—the poet may "think with his pen," as very frequently happens; but into the limning of each individual trait taken separately these two always enter, one before the other, the flash of genius that first sees the landscape in the imagination, and the handiwork that follows.

The production of a work of art is essentially a psychological process—and an interesting one—and as such we shall consider it.

The first step is the presentation, the evolution, the perfection of the idea. Outside the artist's mind is nature. As his eye roves over its landscapes, its life, its movement, he fixes on one idea. Now, this first germ-idea anybody may have. The artist goes further. The seed falls in good ground and the idea takes root. His attention is fixed on it, it becomes interesting, then absorbs his sensibility, his desires, his passions—he loves it for the fullness of being it contains. This is genius. Being an artist, he thinks of producing that idea; the idea has started on its journey through the mind; its terminus will be concrete reproduction. Now, this aim is present to the artist from the start, so the idea does not turn up the way to pure intellectuality; it turns down towards the sensible; it becomes incarnated in a living image. Then it goes on, and as it goes it gathers to it, by association, all kindred ideas and emotions by its way. These ideas, images and emotions have rested where they were first put, in the artist's apprenticeship, when he went around begging from nature, studying her, borrowing from her. Now they are aroused by the master-idea and rally round it.

Here, then, is one chief idea, and a pell-mell mass of other ideas, relevant and irrelevant, around it. Then commences another work, more active on the part of the artist. He sets before him this one idea to be brought out, one effect to be achieved, one "dominant character to stand forth." Then from among that mass of other ideas he selects the means to the end before him. Those that will not help he dismisses, to use another time. Those that will help he selects. This is the task of "taste." Now, these means will be the component and subordinate elements of the masterpiece. They will not suit just as they are; they must be changed to fit, made to bear more directly on the chief idea. They must all converge on that. They must be shaped to make a graceful and shapely vessel:

 $^{^{\}bf 46}$ Taine, Phil. de l'Art, Vol. II., p. 3. Poe insists on this for the short story.

they must be sawed and planed, fitted to the grand whole. And then finally, when this is done, when the idea of his work is perfectly formed, when all is subordinated and in place, then the idea which was planted in the beginning has sprung up into—the ideal. Henceforth all his efforts will be to realize this ideal in the concrete.

But first let us look at the value of each of the ideas thus far exposed.

Before all, what led the artist to go through all these phases? What was he aiming at? What guided him in the long labor of rejecting and selecting and changing his means? It was the sight of one thing—an ideal; all was looking to that. Of course, we must admit that in this process the conceptions borrowed from nature do undergo a metamorphosis, a sublimation—a transfiguration, if you will; that is, there is an ideal in art. On that point rests the whole theory of art.

Two ideals must be distinguished between at the outset. We have seen that every created thing is created, inasmuch as it is a realization of an ideal type, the exemplary cause of its perfection. This is the objective ideal; it is eternal, divine, the Thought of God. Now man, who has this necessary, fatal tendency to the Infinite feels it in this case, too, and this other ideal we have spoken of before (p. 23)—the subjective ideal—is his striving to reach that perfect eternal ideal of each thing; it is his idea of what that is in itself. He does not see it, nor reach it directly, but he has a tendency to find out what is the perfection of the object before him. So, in a certain way, those writers are justified who insist so strongly that the ideal is not one single fixed type for each thing. To all practical purposes it is not; each man conceives his ideal differently. This is the reason why no matter how old a thought may be it can always be made new by individual thought, if only a man will do it.

This process of idealization is usual, necessary, just. Imitation is not art; art is not art if it imitates perfectly. The photograph is not a work of art. Art is imitative, yes; but the thing is imitated as I see it, as it passes through my mind and is executed by my hand. In this fact lies the implicit condemnation of the school of Realism. In reality there are two points of view, Idealism and Realism. Undue pressure on either leads to vice and error. Many are the reasons for this. Not the least is the fact that, no matter how hard an artist may try, he cannot imitate exactly, he cannot keep out of his work his own personality—his own or a borrowed one. Then, by the very conditions of art it is impossible; the candle flame—with fire and light—cannot be reproduced on the canvas; it must be subjected to art's conditions; music is not a mere mocking-

bird song of the noises of nature.⁴⁷. Imitation is a contradiction,⁴⁸ art is not nature, nature is better than any imitation, and, as we have seen, art surpasses, goes beyond nature, in unity and general beauty. If it does not, it ceases to be art.⁴⁹

On the other hand, pure idealism is equally reprehensible and impossible in practice. It is the mean, the joining of the two, that strikes the true note; the artist must not turn his face away from nature, he must not turn away from the mirror he will hold up to her; but, on the other hand, he will not, as a true artist, servilely copy her; he cannot if he would, for his impression must pass through the will of his mind; it will come out as he conceives its type of perfection—and this is the true, the only tenable Idealism. It can be expressed in one word—Interpretation; the artist interprets nature; he seizes her relations, coördinates them, presents them in unity, sounds just the precise notes he catches of that

. . . still sad music of humanity, . . . that impels All thinking things, all objects of all thought, And rolls through all things.

The artist exists only on account of nature; she is mistress, he is messenger; but he reports his message in his own way.

Another notion or two on the ideal, for greater clearness. The ideal is the middle stage between conception and execution; the former culminates in it, the latter strives after it, just as the former was striving after the objective ideal. This ideal we speak of is the internal expression of his idea of perfection; the execution is his mere effort to realize that expression as best he can with the hard, unwieldy clay of words. The ideal is a sensible, internal form in the imagination; the work of art is a sensible form—external, in fact, and more or less resembling the ideal.

By sin creation is a wreck, a sad and dreary ruin. And sin is essentially ugly. Ugly are its effects. But the mind can rebuild this ugly ruin; it can withhold its gaze from the defects of poor, maimed nature, and see in her only what she ought to have been, what God meant her to be. This is idealizing. It is the mystic gaze of the privileged one who is admitted to look at things in their beginnings, as they are in the creating hand of God, to whom it is given to conceive, more nearly than the rest of men, what was and is for ever the sublime, transcendent Thought of God in

⁴⁷ Mercier, Ontologie, p. 600.

⁴⁸ Of course, this does not refer to "imitation," such as it is, given as a practice exercise in writing, painting, etc. That is imitation of another piece of art. We are speaking of direct imitation of nature.

⁴⁹ Besides, art is freed from the laws nature is subjected to—of time and space, teleological and physical. Art rises above nature. *Cf.* Rabier, *op. cit.*, p. 649.

contemplation of His own ineffable Essence. This will be the ideal man, an equation with that which God meant him to be.

Before passing to the second step in art—the execution of the realization of the ideal, a look must be cast at what intervenes. The ideal is conceived; what makes the artist speak it out? What has made him think all along of speaking it out? Whence is the force behind that rushing torrent of beauty? What is its nature? The answer is, inspiration. But what is inspiration, that motor force, the gift of artists only? In part we have already stated it, but more remains to be said.

Kant and the German school⁵⁰ give as one of the qualities of the æsthetic emotion Universality, by which they mean a force compelling us to speak out what we have seen. A better word given is Sociability. It is evident that they refer to inspiration; it is one step forward. The researches of some modern psychologists can help us accomplish the task. Among these we find a law⁵¹ known as "the Dynamic Law of Ideas." Briefly it is this: every idea tends to the act it represents or recalls. The idea, once received, "intellectualizes" itself, i. e., turns off to the abstract, or transfers itself to the organism, along the nerves, until it results, fatally, in the act; it becomes incarnate. Two things conduce to the latter effect; the idea's "quality"—i. e., the more sensible, rich in image, concrete, it is, the stronger the propulsion and its "quantity"—i. e., the greater and stronger the associations it rouses up and gathers to itself as it goes along the stronger again is the compelling force. Now, nowhere are these two conditions realized as in the artist, and this, joined to that subtle force, which we cannot define, known as genius, constitutes "the fine frenzy" we call inspiration.

The idea is now trembling on the verge of realization; the artist, pushed forward by all the force of inspiration behind him, sets his hand to the task. And at the outset let us recall once more a caution we have repeated elsewhere, that there is a distinction between expression and execution. Whether the artist conceive all his work beforehand or part by part, pen in hand, "think on paper," in either case the ideal is expressed, before being "concreted," either in whole or in part.

The artist's task is, now, to realize as best he may, this internal expression of his ideal. For, as we have seen, not only is perfection and beautiful conception of the ideal demanded of him, but,

⁵⁰ Schiller, etc., followed in France by Renouvier and Rabier.

⁵¹ It has been well explained and developed, with another end in view, in an excellent book by l'Abbé Eymieu, Le Gouvernement de soi-même, pp. 28-121.

as a second law, perfect and beautiful correspondence to that conception in its outward manifestation. Indeed, it might even be said that he is not an artist, at least for the general public, except on condition of producing a work of art. On the other hand, what of the multitudes of unknown men and women there are in the world, those "mute, inglorious Miltons," who cannot, by force of circumstance, speak out, or "trace with the magic hand of chance" those "huge cloudy symbols of a high romance" their prophetic eyes discern. Are they not as truly artists as all the Grays and Keats and Miltons that have lived?⁵²

What is the difference, then, between this army of unfortunates and those who have given us our glorious masterpieces of statuary or song? It is the possession of this second great condition of art—power of expression, skill, command over their instrument, be it chisel or vocabulary. It is also a difference of character. The true artist is a man of strong coördinating faculties, vigorous, energetic will, 53 powerful mental synthesis, indomitable courage and resolution. Again, he is a man of taste; he can distinguish the good and the bad in his own work and modify it or add to it accordingly. There is a constant effort, an unceasing supervision over his hand; he always goes at high pressure, putting forth his very best every moment, 54 and yet there must reign over all the most perfect spontaneity.

Add all this together and it is easily seen that we have not robbed the artist of any of his glory, but given it him in double measure, since his is not only the merit of a beautiful conception, but also of having seized that fleeting image with strong, compelling hands and chained it, still palpitating, to an imperishable concrete form. His instrument is skill, his guide is taste, his motive power is force of will; above all sits the transcendent form of genius, below is his material, be it words or oil or stone; and the product is the undying masterpiece.

That is all very nice from our point of view; from the artist's it is different. His is a weary lot, to be condemned eternally to gaze on Beauty, to yearn after her passionately—and never to grasp her to his satisfaction; her shade slips through his outstretched arms, and he is left desolate as any Æneas. It is to this disproportion between his ideal and his fulfillment that F. W. H. Myers

⁵² An affirmative answer is given by A. C. Benson, "From a College Window," pp. 155-156, while De Wulf, Rev. Neo-Scholastique ('07, p. 491) goes so far as to call artists all who can love a work of art.

⁵⁸ At least as far as their profession is concerned. Sometimes will-power is lacking to them in all other respects.

⁵⁴ There are exceptions, of course. We are speaking of artists in the production of a consistent masterpiece.

greatly attributes the pathos of Virgil.⁵⁵ Besides, what the artist does attain is at the cost of infinite pains, pains of preparation, pains of actual work. Indeed, we might say that, did he not feel this weariness and disgust at his own work, he would be no artist. His vision must always surpass his execution, else his vision is no artist's. God only is truly the Creator, only He can produce what He sees just as He sees it, only He can have perfect proportion between his thought and his work. "Ipse dixit et facta sunt."⁵⁶ Not so the artist; to him it is not given to tell the world all he knows and sees.⁵⁷

Le Meilleur demeure en moi-même Mes vrais vers ne seront parlus.⁵⁸

To him it is not granted to express the divine; he must be content to bear with the puny conditions of this life of spirit chained to matter.

One other word before passing to the study of the third element of Literature. Expression is of two kinds. Expression, properly speaking, has for office to produce in the soul a certain activity. But there is another kind of expression whose effect is to evoke a still further activity than that at first caused.⁵⁹ It is called suggestion and, by some, poetry.60 This poetry is in prose or verse, statues or temples, canvas or music, and a sculptor, a painter, a musician is a poet inasmuch as he can evoke this further activity. Very frequently this activity will be one of another order than the one first caused; if the senses are involved, as almost always, it will be one of another sense. An example will make this clear. Take that famous painting of Millet, "The Angelus." In the foreground, the two praying peasants; then a long stretch of field, then, on the horizon, a church. The eye is well pleased with the tranguil scene. But has it no message for the ear as well? Do we not hear something on looking on this picture? Yes; that whole space of field is filled with the riotous sound of the village church bells; and we seem to hear it, too. Thus did the artist make his picture, intentionally, no doubt, suggestive as well as descriptive.

The act on our part takes place in the imagination; there one sense calls out to another, new memories are brought up, new perspectives lined out, whole vistas of hitherto undreamed-of thought are opened out, suggested by the "poetry" of the work. As this device has a large place in literature, the idea will return.

⁵⁵ Classical Essays, Vol. II, Essay on Virgil.

⁵⁶ Ps. xxxii., 9.

⁵⁷ Rev. de Phil., Sortais, '03, p. 337.

⁵⁹ Sully Prudhomme.

⁵⁹ Mercier, op. cit., pp. 512-513.

⁶⁰ Rabier, op. cit., pp. 641-642.

3. SPEECH.

Thus far we have described the two general elements in the definition of Literature. It remains to make the application of these to the particular case of the subject in hand. We have studied beauty and the beautiful expression of thought. Let us go on to that which distinguishes literature from other modes of expression, expression by speech.

By the definition it is laid down that literature is an art. This definition has some need of defense, since it is often enough attacked. Art is beautiful expression in general. But thought is expressed in more ways than one; there is expression of an ideal in marble, in colors, in sounds, in speech; by reason of the special nature of man, this last mode is the most perfect, and when it is done beautifully it is an art.

But the objection comes in here, is not poetry the only art? Those who say this, such men as V. Cousin, Levèque, etc., lay down the principle that if in anything beauty is not sought for its own sake it is not an art; and of course they assume that only in poetry is this condition verified. Their error is that they have forgotten that in art it is the beauty of form only that is essential. If there is beauty in the matter, too, so much the better. Hence it follows that another aim can be followed as regards the matter. And so eloquence and history can follow other aims than the mere search for beauty for itself and still be arts, provided the expression is beautiful. All speech is transference of thought, and literature is perfect transference of thought. But on what condition is it perfect? On the condition that the expression is beautiful; the reader will recall what we mean by beautiful. Hence this beauty may be sought in the matter and the form or expression, as in poetry; or in the form only, there being another aim as regards the subject-matter, as happens in eloquence and history, which are therefore arts as much as poetry.

An examination of other proofs will afford further light on the true nature of literature. One of these is taken from the conflict between literature and morality. Often it is a dilemma, no literature or no morality. But according to our distinction between the twofold aim of art, the escape from the dilemma, if there is really one, is to admit that the aim of art must always be subjected to the moral law. Indeed, the distinction bears us out wonderfully. The two aims must never go against the moral law—that is the principle. Now, the aim of the form never can; else it is not beautiful, but ugly, and ceases to be literature. But the matter can, for its aim is always free. It is, then, from this side that ethics gets its hold on literature.

Again, the artist is he who can encase his thought in a beautiful form, and since beauty means more perfection of being, i. e., that which is instinct with more that appeals to the ideal of men, it is clear that this can be done by all the kinds of speech, as well as by poetry.

In the other branches of literature, then, beauty is sought for itself sufficiently to make them arts. For seek beauty in your expression and you are an artist, and you can go and seek any other aim you please in your subject-matter, provided it be a morally good one. Wordsworth sought to uplift his fellows to diviner things; Tyrtæus wrote his songs to cheer the Spartans on to victory, yet both are artists, just as Cicero is an artist, and Thucydides and Herodotus. They sought beauty for itself, but they sought it in the expression—enough, we have seen, to make them artists.

The definition once secure and free from attack, it remains to see what principles will preside at the development and growth of literature.

That literature has its fixed laws and principles will hardly be denied. Yet they are no more created by the critics than the laws of nature are by scientists. They exist, and are gathered in from all sides in the masterpieces by the student. They differ in small particulars with the different schools, for taste is an affair of personal feeling and individual likes, but they will always be guided in the essentials by the intellectual principles that repose secure above it.⁶¹

Men are sociable animals. It is their nature that, normally, they cannot live alone; there must always be reaction of one upon another, else there is no unison, no satisfaction of the social need. The instrument of this intercourse is speech, transference of the thought of one from his own mind to his fellows'. All this is mere banality. Now, Literature is nothing else than the best speech done, thought-transference beautifully and perfectly done.

At this point we pause and recall the attention to the two elements of art enlarged on above, idealization or conception, and execution. In literature these are nothing else than the framing of our ideal and the expressing of it in words. Here we have the material for the two principal laws of literature. They follow naturally and are universal. From them in turn can be deduced less general ones, and from these the particular principles that preside at the work of composition and of criticism.

The two principal laws are founded on the true proportion between two objective relations—the object and the thought, the

 $^{^{\}rm 61}\,\it Cf.$ Loughaye, Théorie des Belles-Lettres, pp. 81-89, where he proves that there is an "absolute" in art.

thought and the expression; i. e., the thought or idealization should correspond truly, at base, to the object, and the expression must reproduce exactly the thought. The first of these principles is nothing more than the old scholastic definition of truth—"adæquatio rei et intellectus." As for the second, the expression or execution is said exactly to reproduce the thought, when it makes the same impression, moral and intellectual, on the hearer or reader as the object has on the speaker or writer.

The corollaries of this doctrine are several. The closer the thought produced in the hearer is to the original thought the better is the expression. Any fault in either of the two processes—thought or expression—makes a defect in the ultimate work. The less the thought corresponds to the object and the less the expression corresponds in every way to it the worse it is. The most beautiful and perfect form in itself, but not in proportion to the thought—or indirectly to the object—is worthless; the two laws go together. Hence the test of imperfection and perfection lies in these two laws; they are fundamental and universal, but still very general.

The first is more important than the second of these two laws; the first is an affair of the spirit, the second of matter; the first guides the work of the head, the second that of the hand; the first demands inspiration, the second mere technical skill, while as far as the work of art is concerned, all is done before the second comes in to play.

Now, it becomes necessary to analyze these two principles, to see just what they mean, just where they are to be applied.

At a general glance at the problem one perceives at once two facts and their immediate consequences. One fact is that the object of literature is infinitely various and the other is that the thinking subject is stubbornly individual. Hence it follows that the mind must accommodate itself to all the varying phases of what is subjected to its consideration, but that at the same time it must not try to avoid, indeed cannot help, imprinting on things its own individuality; style must be true to nature, but true to itself as well. Literature is the resultant of these two forces. This must be borne in mind, for it influences all that follows.

Let us take up now the first and more important principle. A mere glance at it as it has been formulated above would suffice to let it be seen that it contains three elements. There is the object conceived, the thinking subject and the object and subject taken together or the object in the grasp of the subject. We will take each of these in succession.

At the threshold of the discussion an object confronts us that must be answered. It is said that the law holds good for objects

456

that exist, but what about the case where there is no object, where the mind dwells only on fictions. We may merely say that the case never entirely exists and that the objection is based on a false conception of the matter, and that such a false conception would lead to the extreme school of idealists, which we have pointed out as the opposite of the extreme Realist school. In short, neither must the mind reproduce the object such as it is, nor yet entirely on what is ideal, but must keep the mean between the two.

Now, what is the range of the objects of literary work? It is twofold, nature and man. There is a third, God, but it embraces, in a transcendent way, the other two. For man has been defined a tendency to the Infinite, and when this tendency is expressed the instrument of expression is speech. However, the term of the tendency cannot be attained directly; it must be reached in its reflections, which are those two objects of literary work, nature and man. It will be noted that this corresponds closely to what was said above of beauty, that it is, in its last analysis, but a reflection of God, of the Infinite Beauty when it exists in nature, is but one of its created external manifestations, a necessary condition of our state.

Hence, it might be said in passing, comes a fuller understanding of why this first law exists and of what it implies, viz., an obligation to express the thought in a beautiful manner, that is, in short, man, in that perfect speech which is literature, must be finally true, beyond and across nature and man, to the Supreme Ideal according to which they are both fashioned.

Nature, the first of these two objects, can be considered by the author or poet in regard to itself, to man, to God. We will do so, and with the intention of bringing out its role in the making of a piece of literature. Thus we shall have discussed the first of the objects of literary work, of what is to be said, leaving the other part, how it is to be said, till later on.

For a poet or a prose writer to consider and describe nature only for herself and in nature is in this respect mere materialism. Yet there are many such, and where we would least expect it. Take, for example, the "Cloud" of Shelley, who, for all that is said of his mysticism, is, after all, one of the most materialistic of all our poets. The poem in question is a mere description—exquisitely beautiful, beyond all doubt—but nothing more. Lamartine has said that "even in nature the earth is only the scenery," the background; man is the interesting figure; and our principle bids us be true to nature.

So the key to nature is man; this was also the guiding principle of Wordsworth. Between nature and man there is an established

harmony. Now, harmony means sympathy and resemblance. And these in turn recall two remarkable psychological facts. We know well that certain sites agree with certain of our moods, and again, that certain other sites, for a mind in repose, induce other moods. Thus, why does the ocean always seem to agree with sadness? Chryseis walks the shore of the "loud-sounding sea," bewailing his stolen child, and the wronged Achilles sits him down and gazes through his tears over the "wine-dark deep" and calls to his seagoddess mother. And Matthew Arnold stands on the beach at Dover and bewails the ebbing Sea of Faith. These are but a few of the striking and well-known instances of what happens often in our daily life. Thus it is that

Tears, idle tears . . . Rise in the heart and gather to the eyes, In looking on the happy autumn fields, And thinking of the days that are no more.

The literary consequences of these two facts are far-reaching and great, and may be said to supply the motive and matter for the greater part of our poetry, and especially that of the nineteenth century. Nature we interpret according to our own emotions and call the autumn fields happy and the rainy day sad; while the matter for comparison, contrast, simile, is enormous.

Last of all, across and through nature we reach to God, the Infinite One. There are four special ways in which we look at Him in nature, as Creator, as Immanent in Nature, as acting in nature by coöperation and preservation, and as Nature's archetype.⁶³ It means simply this, that, without at all being a Pantheist, man must have a pure conception of nature, i. e., a conception free from sense, and this he only has by rising above and across it, up to God. Take, for example, that beautiful passage in the Excursion on the Sea-Shell⁶⁴ and the child listening within it for tidings of the Ocean; and the poet says that the universe is "even such a shell" to the Eye of Faith, and goes on:

And there are times, I doubt not, when to you it doth impart Authentic tidings of invisible things.

We pass by the pagan apotheosis of separate Nature-forces, and through the phenomena that strike the eye we embrace the invisible but only True, Good and Beautiful. This is the source of all symbolism in literature and also the reason why so many of our poets in their mystical view, by pressing unduly on the Immanence of

⁶² Loughaye, p. 159, op. cit. In much of this part of our subject we are but adapting to our plan some of the excellent ideas of this author.

⁶³ Loughaye, op. cit., pp. 179 et seq.

⁶⁴ Cf. in English Poets-Ward, Vol. IV., p. 80.

God, have come to Pantheism-a conception that will be found to be running like an undertone through much of our English poetry. The next object of our view is Man, who can be considered in

his physical or in his moral aspect.

The study and admiration of physical man is insisted on by Taine⁶⁵—and unjustly, it seems to us—as the dominating characteristic of pagan Greece. It is again a materialistic conception, if we neglect to bring out what it is gives the body—"the human form divine"—the physiognomy in repose or in movement—its true beauty. This is the soul that interpenetrates it, informs it, shines out of it. Once more our general law guides us here, for in man it is spirit that dominates matter; so must it in literature, and man's physical appearance be described only as a stepping stone to that which lies within, 66 the beauty of the soul of which it is the sensible expression. This is in particular the great object of drama, fiction and history.

What will the result be? The soul of man pictured as it is or as it should be? If it is entirely the latter, our conception is no longer true to the object, and we shall have a fine collection of pious figure-heads. What, then, is the solution? This; there are always in fiction, etc., certain characters with which the reader is in some sort identified; for them his sympathy is won, from their point of view the other characters and the incidents are viewed, and into their thoughts he is given entrance. These should The others—the antagonistic ones especially may be be ideal. as bad as we like—always provided they are antipathetic. This balance is demanded by one principle, which would be otherwise at fault and is perfectly justified by the facts.

God is transcendently above these two objects. He is aimed at across man and nature; to Him we penetrate; Him, as it were, we see. We interpret finite beings in terms of the Infinite, and as this process becomes more and more conscious the mystical element enters in more and more closely. But the soul does not get at God directly. It is condemned likewise to give its own imprint to things. This is why the power of invention is unlimited, and also why the artist is doomed never to reach perfect execution. He is in a constant struggle to fling himself over the barriers of this world to the Infinite Beyond. And when he does catch at some of the Divine Essence there comes another struggle to keep it aloft, not defiled with the slime of matter.

66 An almost too evident effort to do this is to be found in C. Bronte's

"Jane Eyre."

⁶⁵ Phil. de l'Art, Vol. II. He is pleading a pet thesis, viz., that the dominating character of each period buds out in a corresponding branch of art predominating in that period, and as he chooses sculpture as such a one for Greece, the reason for his contention is plain.

The next element our analysis lays bare in this first principle is the faculties of the soul themselves. It will be remembered we said that the subjective part of beauty lies in its stirring and satisfying the activity of our faculties. A word on each of these faculties with reference to its literary influence and value. Their simple forms are, first of all, the intellect with its ceaseless demand for the reality, for truth in all its clearness and brilliancy; then there is the will that just as necessarily longs for goodness, with its joy at getting a grasp of a concrete good and the consequent fullness of activity; then the senses—especially of sight and hearing, in literature—that delight in certain changes and harmonies of color and sound, and the imagination, faculty of creation, of idealization, of association, of reproduction, resuming in itself all the joys and sorrows of the other faculties, and, last of all, the passions, all summed up in one word, love.

The complex forms of activity are very much more closely connected with literature. These are, principally, habit, which if followed and catered to causes us pleasure, and if contradicted, sorrow; then the highest combined action of the will and intellect—the sublimest force in literature—the religious sentiment, which is man's natural longing for the Infinite Good and a straining to compass it. After that comes that sensuous pleasure of the imagination called reverie, which is a free permission to that faculty to flit about unrestrained. touching lightly and sipping quickly on only the beautiful. Then, last of all, a deeper and more human sentiment, called sympathy. Its influence is very great in letters, and it is one of the greatest principles in art. Jouffroy⁶⁷ calls it the fundamental æsthetic emotion. It is evoked by the image of the state of him who suffers such and such emotions and causes the same in us. For, being especially concrete and strong,68 it tends most forcefully to reproduce itself in action. But it is not as strong as the original, nor subject to the judgments of conscience, hence not unquiet nor uneasy; it has not the same uncomfortable effects as genuine pain and fear and can be abandoned at will. In short, it is sorrow and woe, with all the elements of suffering eliminated and only those of beauty remaining. Thus, sad accounts please us and are called beautiful, which feeling is not at all experienced by him who really suffers. The result, then, of all this on literature is the general rule that all that causes real suffering to any faculty is to be shunned and only that cultivated that pleases the faculty. The effects of this will appear more fully later on.

Little now remains to be said of the last element of our analysis,

⁶⁷ Cours d'Esthétique, pp. 34-35.

⁶⁸ Cf. above, p. 27.

the object in the grasp of the subject. From all that precedes what we have to say is clear. The aim of all idealization is to take man, with his movement and life, and raise him to his best. People sneer at the word "ideal," or at best look suspicious, because of the mistaken idea that it means something vague and abstract. Their scorn would turn to love and admiration did they see that it means not only the intellectual side of man pushed to perfection, but also the emotional side. We do not chase away the passions; we keep them, but we ennoble them.

So we see that in the light of a truly spiritualistic philosophy this principle becomes merely the expression of our imperative need of truth, and truth in its highest form, beauty.

The Second Principle, as we have said, is less important and demands less attention, except in one part—where it touches the idea and exigencies of style. This is, in a way, most important of all. We have up to this dwelt chiefly on what should form the matter of literature, of what the author should say; we shall now treat of how it should be said, though, strictly speaking, as we have seen—this belongs to the first principle also. But it is so closely united with this latter, and, after all, the internal expression is so closely connected with the external, that for all practical purposes it is useless to separate them.

It is this external expression that is aimed at by the Second Principle; hence, too, of course the internal. The outward manifestation of his idea must correspond as nearly as possible to the idea. And when will this equation exist? We answer without hesitation, when his words produce the same impression on the soul of his hearer or reader as it has on his. This is the pervading idea of all this part of the problem, the relation that the writer must always keep before him with his reader.

One of the first consequences of this thought is to recall with new vigor an old, almost discredited, idea. His work must rouse the æsthetic activity of his reader's faculties. It does so in three ways, by convincing, by persuading, by pleasing; maybe not all three at once, but those are the ways. That is to say, his means will be the true, the good, the beautiful, and he will by their help address himself to the mind, the will and again to the whole soul in full, well-ordered activity.

But the chief portion of literature ruled by this second principle is that of style. Two men might have the selfsame thought and yet might and invariably will express it differently; both will observe this second law of writing, and still one will write better than the other. What makes the difference? Style. And what is Style? Style in general is the manner and peculiarity in which a man acts

and in which he differs from others' manners. In writing it is the manner proper to his own individual self. It is the effort of a man to get that equality between his own ideal and its external realization. Now, one man may set the ideal of his thought before him the same as another, but the ideal of its expression is always different. Hence it is true that style is an individual thing, yet we say ordinarily that such a man has no style and another has one. What is meant is that the first has not a good style. Hence it follows that style admits of degrees and so can be improved. What is wanted is to get at what rules its origin and growth. This can be done by a simple application of our second principle to an analysis of the idea of style itself.

Style depends on the way the writer uses two things; words, that stand for ideas, and phrases, that stand for thoughts. By ideas is meant simple concepts of a thing, abstract or concrete, such as table, virtue, book; by thoughts, the judgments we express by propositions or sentences. Our plan is here marked out for us. We shall look at words and phrases successively with reference to the impression they can make on each of the faculties of man.

The principle applies first to words with regard to the mind, whose particular object is truth. And here we must bear in mind that as there is only one way of saying just what we think and as we think it, so there is only one word to express our precise idea with all its nuances—the shades of meaning our own individuality, our point of view, circumstances, etc., give it. This is precision and propriety of diction. The importance of this choice of words is immense. Some one has said:69 "If our words are not precise, the ideas they arouse will not be precise; if his ideas are not precise, the reader's principles are not assured, and if he has no assured principles, he will take no vigorous resolutions." Which reminds us of a certain sad story that ends: "and all for the want of a horseshoe nail." And indeed the application is striking. But there is a more important conclusion still, that of the necessity of precision in the ideas themselves. And the importance is all the more great, as the predominance of spirit over matter is established and needful.

With regard to the imagination and the use of words we have but to recall that eulogy of Virgil: "All the grace of all the Muses often flowering in a single word," and to point to Tennyson himself as a striking example of what is to be brought out. As the *correct* word is demanded by the mind for the truth of a pure idea, so is the *picturesque* word needed by the imagination for the right image; the two cases are the same, only in the one it is image and in the other idea.

⁶⁹ Cf. Loughaye, op. cit., p. 316.

As for the emotions, there is no need here to recall how one word can stir up a whole lot of emotional uneasiness, and then how important it is in good style to use just the right word and use it rightly. This it is given only to great writers like Bossuet to master fully; but in a more or less excellent degree all popular speakers and orators call on it to a great extent; hence the birth of a whole troop of slogans, maxims, epigrams, that live in the people's mind and stir them to feeling and to action.

The effect of all this care and study of words will be to make the writer free from their tyranny and from any Micawber-like devotion to the sound of senseless combinations, than which tyranny and devotion hardly any can be imagined more debasing for an author.

The second element in style, the phrase or sentence, corresponds to the thought or mental judgment. Such judgments are of two kinds, implicit and explicit. The first has also been called the complex idea, and is expressed by a combination such as "a good boy," "le bon Dieu," "a poor man," where a judgment is clearly implied. The literary consequence of a study of this form is the necessity of justness of attribute as regards the demands of the mind, and as for what the imagination requires, the "picturesque epithet." The function of these parasites is to complete the incomplete notion contained in the noun or to add further truthfulness of life and color to the image it conveys, to bring out the delicate shade of meaning the *nuance*, or to touch a new shade of coloring into the whole picture.

One caution must be observed, however, and in this the writer will be imitating nature, i. e., in her frugality. Economy and even austerity of epithets is a real necessity for a finished artist, as it seems to be an invariable drag on the wings of youth. It is not lack of color or imagination that is recommended, but a frugality in epithet, a restraint on the impulse to fling whole daubs of color on the canvas, when a few skillful touches will bring out the picture just as well or better. Indeed, if a writer uses up all his epithets on everything and anything he will have no more to use when he really needs them. Besides, if he uses them too much, they will wear out, and, like new money, quickly lose their sheen, and finally come to stand for nothing at all.

Then comes now, last of all, the full sentence, that stands for the developed thought, adequately expressed. Then, to follow our proposed plan, the mind first puts it under observation and there comes with it its eternal demand for truth. Now, a judgment is true, according to Aristotle, when it expresses a relation that in objective reality really exists, false when it expresses what is not

so. From this—still following Aristotle—come the three essential conditions the mind lays on the phrase. The sentence or group of sentences must be clear, brief and one. It will have clearness when the true relation of above stands out fully, with nothing to veil it from us; brevity when the same relation is set forth with no undue encumbrance of words; unity when well defined and cut off from all that is not itself. Clearness is autonomy of the thought, an individual and clear-cut existence won for it. There are no rules for it; it depends most of all on clearness of thought, and the only rule for that is assiduity and perseverance in thinking. Of itself the thought, if persevered in long enough, throws down all the barriers between us and it. Brevity, or more correctly, relative brevity, means not to say everything in few words-that is evident—but to say everything only in as few words as it demands; no superfluity, no parasites, no foreign elements, no parentheses. All this means courage—courage to reject some wellturned phrase the writer is proud of, but which does not bear directly on the idea. And last of all, unity is the injection of one directing principle into the mass of conflicting elements—the subordinating of the parts with a view to showing up the whole. The rules for it are many; the one real rule is to have one idea, to group all around that and cast away all that does not throw it into relief, keeping the order of climax, keeping together the details that go together.

There is but one exception to these three conditions, and that is not more than an apparent one. It is that quality which is called commonly suggestiveness or allusiveness. It is the staple of all poetry and indeed made by some the definition of poetry. Its virtue consists in this, that it does not tell all, but by a slight touch rouses up a train of thought in the reader, which carries him beyond what is actually said, but is really implied. It is the culmination of art and the triumph of persevering thought, and is only to be used as the writer approaches more and more the purely literary and gets away from the exact formulas of mathematics and business.

But besides these purely intellectual elements there are two others that are absolutely necessary in literature; they are the imaginative and the emotional elements. Their necessity arises from the comparison of the phrase with the sensibility and the imagination.

What is the imaginative style? First of all, it does not mean fiction, nor yet again a figurative style, or one abounding in comparisons. It does mean anything that in addition to helping us to understand the thought, makes us see it. To see the truth in a concrete, sensible form, to use the image rather than the idea, to

⁷⁰ Cf. above, p. 30.

choose in every case the word that carries a picture rather than a mere cold conception—this is the sum of that impression we have when we come from reading some author and say: "He has an imaginative style."

Another result of the influence of the imagination in the phrase is this: This faculty has a way of seizing first of all on the most attractive feature of a picture, like a child that likes the gaudy color. It must be humored. And so to catch its eye the good writer puts in a striking place the salient feature of any thought. The importance of all this is easily seized through what we have called above the "dynamic law of ideas." If the idea enters the mind bare and pale with an abstract light, it intellectualizes itself, loses itself in the chilly mists of mere speculation. If, on the contrary, it becomes charged with sense and concreteness, it takes a strong hold not only on the sensible part of the soul, but even, as has been shown, on the motor nerves, forcing them to action. Now, this incarnation of thought is done by the imagination only. Hence its great role in all good writing. Then, besides, since the æsthetic emotion is in the full activity of all the faculties, and since the imagination is the only path to some of them, its importance is still further shown.

Much of what we have said of the imagination applies also to the emotions, for these also require the truth in the concrete, the salient character, etc. It has, indeed, been said of oratory that "in proportion as it is a thing of the intellect it will fail, and as a matter of the heart it will succeed," and the same may be said of all writing that aims at being truly literary.

The conclusion, then, of all this is the need of the same guidance of the reason in matters of sense and of the steady gaze that focuses itself on the object till the latter stands out concrete and clear.

The last consideration with regard to style is the influence on the phrase of the external senses. As we have seen, the only two of the senses connected with our subject are sight and hearing; of these the sense of sight is only indirectly connected with literature, and that through the imagination. So we are here only concerned with sound and hearing.

There is only one law regarding the sound of the phrase, and that is a negative one.⁷¹ The sound must never offend the ear or obstruct the meaning; we are not bound to flatter the ear nor consciously help the meaning. The reason for this rule is that in halting the action of external perception the work of the understanding is halted, too, which is contrary to the general law of faculty-activity. This halting of the organ is done in three prin-

⁷¹ Loughaye, op. cit., p. 420.

cipal ways, by hiatus, by assurance, by a succession of rough vowel or consonant sounds.

But while there is no strict obligation to flatter the ear, the literary masterpiece is not well off without it—unless, indeed, the roughness is made up in another way, as in the case of Carlyle or Browning. But for all that, the power of sounds is great, not for themselves, but for what they symbolize. As in nature certain sounds evoke certain emotions, so in art the music of the phrase tames the soul. This power of sound over sense is great in its proper measure. We shall examine the power it has over each of the faculties, remembering that the only reason why it is considered at all is that it really can provoke faculty-activity and thus assist the thought. This aid is given in three ways, by harmony, by melody, by rhythm.

Harmony is a chord, a single set of sounds grouped together, in a word or syllable. It is the basic element of the two following qualities. Melody is a succession of several pleasing sounds, grouped with a view to promoting in its own way the effect of the sense. In this respect literature is superior to music, which lacks the more properly expressive element and has only sound. A beautiful example of melody in prose is Demosthenes' famous description of the arrival in the evening at Athens of the news of the battle of Platea.72 Rhythm is a grouping of sounds in beautiful fashion, but with a sensible and visible proportion of sonorous groups recurring with periodicity. This is used chiefly in poetry and is carried to its furthest use in the refrain of a song. It differs from melody in that melody is a general quality, a general effect of a work of art, while rhythm is a special—the most important instance of it. The strange hypnotic power of sound on the soul is well known and deserves a more extended study than we can give it. A few general traits must suffice.

The rule enforced by the imagination is that, while respecting the thought, the sound (abstraction now made of all sense) more or less brings up before our eyes the intended image, without the help of the meaning. One particularly striking usage of this is "onomatopæia," where the representative power of mere sounds is pushed to its extreme.

The subtle effect of sound on the emotions is chiefly noticed in music and is well described in Dryden's "Alexander's Feast," whose sub-title is, by the way, "The Power of Music." However, this connection with certain states of the soul is vague enough and only touches such general emotions as sadness, joy, anger, pride, etc.

The reason now comes on the scene with her ever-recurring demand to be respected as the queen, and we do not dispute her right.

⁷² De Corona, 169.

But in this demand she can be helped by even the music of writing. Thus the logical operation of the thought is greatly aided by the rhythm of the period and of repetition, and this is precisely the reason for the existence of these two forms in eloquence. Again, the memory is helped by a striking combination of sound, as happens in epigrams, for instance, whose sharp staccato cadence remains long ringing in the ear, thus forwarding the aim of the speaker.

This general study of the nature of style is now finished. In summing up this remark might be made: that in general, style is the man himself—as Buffon said—while it differs with each individual and has his own peculiar stamp of character. It is not a mere knowledge of the technique of language, nor yet a command over one's vocabulary. These things are indispensable conditions, but only conditions. Many may come thus far and yet have no style. It is here that the soul enters in, as may readily be admitted by one familiar with the tone of all Newman's writings, for example; like a picture of Reubens, it is recognizable anywhere. In short, there is only one style, but that one is infinitely various.

We will finish this paper with a word on the Aim to be pursued by a writer, a subject touched on here more than once, and especially in vindicating our definition of literature. It is possible, we have seen, to pursue, in this case, two aims simultaneously, that of the form, that of the matter. The aim of the form is fixed. for any writer who wishes to produce literature. It is the quest of the beautiful. The aim of the matter is free, for the free will of man; that is, absolutely speaking. But viewed from a moral point of view it is not free, any more than sin is in any other walk of life. But it is not always that the error is made in the choice of an aim for the matter. Sometimes a writer like Wordsworth, in his eagerness for the goodness of the second aim, forgets the first, and the result is the hideous banalities that permit it to be said of him what Veuillot said of Victor Hugo: "No one ever wrote more beautiful or more ugly verses."

It is this division of the aim that permits the science of aim and motive, ethics, to gain a foothold in the domain of art. This science rules the aim of the matter, since that of the form is already fixed and that, we have seen, entirely in harmony with it. The second aim can be manifold, provided it squares with the moral law. It may be to instruct, to enlighten, to uplift, as in the case just quoted of Wordsworth. It may be any other, but provided always it be compatible with the laws of beauty, and of God.

J. Wilfrid Parsons, S. J.

FRANCIS PAUL LIBERMANN.

HE approaching beatification of the Ven. Francis Paul Libermann will be an event of unique. Judaism to Catholicism are rare; rarer still is the elevation of convert Jews to the Christian priesthood; but the fact of a Jew being raised to the honors of the altar is, we believe, both so singular and striking as to rivet the attention of the whole Catholic world upon the religious attitude of that ancient and interesting race towards the Church, which, it may be assumed, is about to confer this signal distinction upon one of its members. "Humanly speaking," writes Archbishop Croke in the preface to the life of the founder of the Congregation of the Holy Heart of Mary, "it is no easy matter to effect the conversion of a Jew. The grace of God is, of course, omnipotent; but what I mean to say is that there are peculiar circumstances connected with the history and training of the Hebrew people which are the reverse of favorable to conversions amongst them. They may be said, indeed, to have an inborn or hereditary hatred of the religion, no less than of the name and followers of Jesus Christ. Jewish converts are, consequently, very rare, and, when met with at all, are found for the most part to have belonged to the humbler and less prejudiced classes of their countrymen." Libermann was an exception to this general rule. He belonged to the higher or educated class of Jews, from whom the rabbins, masters in Israel and leaders of thought among the most intellectual section of the Hebrews, are drawn. Steeped from his youth in an atmosphere of Judaism of the most rigid and recondite type, he possessed whatever culture of mind is possible to one reared in such a narrow and exclusive school, where rabbinical learning is concentrated upon the pedantic conservation of antique teachings and traditions.

The fifth son of a Jewish rabbin, zealous to fanaticism for the punctilious observance of the Mosaic law and held in high esteem among his co-religionists for his great Talmudic learning, he was born on April 12, 1804, at Saverne, in Alsace—now, since its remcorporation with Germany, called Elsass—and, in accordance with Jewish usage, circumcised when eight days old and given the name of Jacob. His childhood was not a happy one. Though of a naturally delicate constitution, which should have insured more regard for his health, he was brutally ill used by a cruel master, whose rough treatment of the sickly child brought on additional infirmities, traces of which he retained all his life. His mother, Lia Haller, died in 1813. The deprivation did not mean so much to him as to

a Christian child. Among the Jews the mother's share in the education and up-bringing of children is secondary to that of the father, particularly when, as in this instance, the head of the household is a rabbin. Although but little care seems to have been bestowed upon his body, his mind was steeped in an atmosphere of the strictest Judaism, and nothing was left undone to imbue him with an aversion to Christianity until the very sight of a priest filled him with fear and horror. It is an error to suppose that young Israelites are formed on the Old Testament. It is the teaching of the Talmud that is instilled into them. This work, the compilation of generations of Pharisees, is a corpus of doctrines and usages in twelve folio volumes, the main purport of which is to interpret the Mosaic Law in conformity with the spirit of oral traditions, handed down from sire to son for ages. It exhales in every page a hatred of Christ and of the Christian name instinct with the spirit of the deicidal race who in Pilate's presence clamored for the crucifixion of the Just One, crying out: "His blood be upon us and upon our children." In after years Libermann related how, as a child, when he saw the parish priest of Saverne, wearing his surplice and stole, returning from the cemetery, the very sight of vestments and cross so terrified him that he ran into the nearest shop and hid behind the counter; and when, on another occasion, he met him on the road coming from a sick call he hurriedly climbed over a wall and scampered through the fields. Initiated from his infancy in the wording of the Law, at thirteen he was solemnly and legally inducted into the synagogue, and began the intricate study of philology and Talmudic exegesis. To become a learned and distinguished rabbin was then the sole object of his desires, in furtherance of which his father sent him to the rabbinical school of Metz. from which it was intended he should proceed to that of Paris.

Meanwhile his eldest brother, Samson, after attaining the extreme limits of Talmudic studies, abandoned the project of becoming a rabbin, and, having qualified in medicine, became one of the leading physicians in the town and district of Strasburg. Having already conceived a distaste for the sophisms of the Talmud, his belief in Judaism was shaken, and coming across a copy of the New Testament it captured and captivated him and his wife at the first reading. The "still, small voice" had spoken; its whisperings touched their hearts. Under that first vague impression they formed the resolution and promised, if Providence granted them a son, to present him, not to the synagogue, but to the Church of Christ. Grace had sown the seeds of faith in their souls; they fructified in a congenial soil, and on the 15th of March, 1824, Dr. Libermann and his wife were received into the Catholic Church.

When they heard of his conversion the rabbin of Saverne and the whole family put on mourning, as if for a funeral. The young student at Metz, bewailing his brother's "apostasy," went to Strasburg to win him back to the synagogue, but only to hear from his sister-in-law these remarkable words, consciously or unconsciously prophetic: "You shall one day be not only a Christian like ourselves, but a priest and an apostle."

The conversion of his brothers, Felkel and Samuel, brought about by Dr. Libermann's zeal, was to precede the fulfillment of this prophecy. The story of his own conversion Jacob related in 1850 to M. Gamon, a director of St. Sulpice in the Solitude of Issy, near Paris. "I was about twenty years of age," he said, "when it pleased God to begin the work of my conversion. Until then I had studied the Talmud under the direction of my father, who was a distinguished rabbin. He was pleased with my progress and flattered himself with the thought that I would one day be the worthy inheritor of his office, his science and the high esteem in which he was held among his co-religionists. About the period of which I speak he determined to send me to Metz to complete my studies. His object in doing so was less the acquisition of a science which I could as well have learned from him than to give me an occasion for displaying my knowledge and my talents and to render me eminent amongst the rabbins, who came in great numbers to be instructed in this town. He gave me letters of introduction for two professors of the Israelitic school, one of whom had been his pupil and the other his friend. It was then that the merciful design of Providence began to make itself felt in my regard. God, who wished to draw me from the error in which I was plunged, disposed my heart by causing me to meet with disappointments and ill treatment which I had by no means expected. Until then I had lived in Judaism in good faith, without in the least suspecting that I was in error; but about that time I fell into a kind of religious indifference, which in a few months brought me to a state of utter infidelity. In the meantime I read the Bible, but with distrust; its miracles discouraged me, and I believed them no longer. At this period my elder brother, then a medical doctor at Strasburg, embraced Christianity. I at first attributed such a step on his part to natural motives. I thought that he had found himself in the same state of mind as myself regarding the Jewish religion; yet I blamed him for having by his abjuration plunged our parents into grief. Nevertheless, I did not fall out with him. We even commenced at this time an epistolary correspondence, which I began by highly censuring him for the step he had taken and by exposing to him my opinions on the miracles of the Bible. I told him, among other things, that, were those miracles true, the conduct of God would be unaccountable, and that it was impossible to understand why God should have wrought so many wonders for our idolatrous and faithless fathers, when He no longer does the same in favor of their children, who have served Him so long and with such perfect fidelity. I concluded that those ancient miracles should be rejected as an invention of the imagination and of the credulity of our forefathers. My brother replied that he firmly believed the miracles of the Bible, that God worked no more miracles¹ at the present day because they were no longer necessary; that the Messiah having come, God needed not to dispose His people to receive Him; that all the prodigies of the Old Testament had no other object than to prepare that great event.

"This letter made some impression on me. I said to myself that my brother had gone through the same studies as I had, yet I still persisted in attributing his conversion to human motives, and the effect produced by his letter was soon destroyed. The doubt which had taken hold of my mind was too deeply rooted to yield to so slight an effort. God in His goodness had prepared other and stronger ones.

"At this time one of my fellow-students showed me a Hebrew book without punctuation, which he could not read, because he was just beginning the study of Hebrew. I ran over its contents with great eagerness; it was the Gospel translated into Hebrew. I was very much struck by this reading. But here again the numerous miracles wrought by our Lord Jesus Christ were lying as so many new obstacles on my path.

"I began to read the 'Emile' of Rousseau. Who could imagine that this work, so calculated to shake the faith of a believer, was one of the means God chose to lead me to the true religion? It was in the 'Confession du Vicaire Savoyard' that I found the passage which struck me. There Rousseau exposes the reasons for and against the divinity of Jesus Christ, and he concludes with these words: 'I have not been hitherto in a position to know what a rabbin of Amsterdam would reply to that.'

"I could not help avowing to myself that I did not see, either, what answer might be given to this question. Such were my dispositions at this period, and yet the work of my conversion did not make much progress. It was then I learned that two more of my brothers, who lived at Paris, had just been received into the bosom

¹ This, of course, is the crude expression of a neophyte, and, if interpreted literally to the foot of the letter, would savor of the old-fashioned Protestant view on the subject of miracles, which, far from having ceased, are of continuous occurrence and one of the notes of the holiness of the true Church.

of the Catholic Church. This moved my soul to its very depths, for I foresaw that I, too, might ultimately follow their example. Thank God! this so happened. I had a great love for my brothers, and I suffered at the thought of the isolation in which I would soon find myself in my father's house. I had a friend who shared my views with regard to religion. I saw him often. Our studies and our walks were almost in common. He advised me to go to Paris to see M. Drach, who was already converted, and to examine seriously what I was to do before taking on myself the obligations of the rabbinic profession. I fully agreed to this proposition. But I should have my father's approval, and this was no easy thing to obtain. To write to him about my projects would have been the surest means of frustrating them. I therefore decided on going to settle matters orally. I arrived at Saverne very fatigued, having made my journey on foot. My father allowed me a little rest before speaking to me of his fears; but before the end of the day he sent for me. He wished, without further delay, to clear up his doubts. There was an easy means at his disposal; he had only to question me on my studies, and, in particular, on the Talmud. My answers would be the surest test of my application. He knew well that there is no possibility of imposing on a master in a subject which demands so much labor, memory, talent and practice as the study of the Talmud. This work, though not beyond the stretch of an ordinary mind, requires an acute and ready intelligence to be accurately rendered and properly explained. . . Only those who have studied its contents long and recently could ever be able to interpret them with that facility which characterizes the true Talmudists. father was of their number, and in ten minutes all his suspicions in my regard would have been changed into sad realities had not the Almighty, who wished to bring about my conversion, hastened to my assistance, almost miraculously.

"The first of my father's questions was precisely one on which it is impossible to pass without showing the exact state of one's knowledge. For two years I had almost entirely neglected the study of the Talmud, and what I knew I had learned with dislike, having read it as one who only wishes to save appearances. However, I had scarcely heard the question when an abundant light illumined my mind and showed me all that I should say. I was myself in the greatest astonishment. I could not account for such facility in explaining things which I had hardly read. I marveled exceedingly at seeing the vivacity and promptitude with which my mind seized upon all that was obscure and enigmatical in the passage which was about to decide my journey. But my father was still more amazed than myself; he was overwhelmed with joy and happi-

ness, as he found that I was still worthy of him and that his fears and the unfavorable suspicions which had been put into his mind concerning me were entirely groundless. He embraced me tenderly and bathed my face with his tears. 'I truly had suspicions,' he said, 'that they were again calumniating you when they accused you of spending your time in studying Latin and neglecting to acquire the knowledge necessary for your profession.' And he showed me all the letters he had received on this subject.

"Permission to go to Paris was soon afterwards granted, and, despite the warnings that he received that I was going to join my brothers and do as they had done, he could not believe such a thing. He gave me a letter for the rabbin Deutz (the father of the Deutz who betrayed the Duchess of Berry); but as from another quarter I was recommended to M. Drach, I addressed myself to him. However, some time afterwards I delivered my letter to M. Deutz; I even, by way of formality, asked him for a book, which I returned soon after, and then visited him no more.

"I spent a few days with my brother, and I was greatly surprised at his happiness. I was, however, still very far from being changed and converted. M. Drach found a place for me at the College Stanislaus, whither he conducted me himself. I was led into a cell and there left alone, with two works by Lhomond, the 'History of Christian Doctrine' and the 'History of Religion.' This was for me a most trying moment. The profound solitude, the appearance of that room admitting the light through a small window in the roof, the thought of being so far from home, from my parents and acquaintances, all tended to plunge my soul into intense sadness. My heart was oppressed with the most awful melancholy. Then it was that, remembering the God of my fathers, I threw myself on my knees and conjured Him to enlighten me in my search after the true religion. I besought Him, if the faith of the Christians was the true one, to make it known to me; but if it was false, to remove me at once from the reach of its influence. The Lord, ever near to those who invoke Him from the inmost depths of their hearts, heard my prayer. I was immediately enlightened; I saw the truth; faith penetrated my mind and my heart. Having commenced the reading of Lhomond, I easily and firmly adhered to all that is related therein about the life and death of Jesus Christ. Even the mystery of the Eucharist, rather imprudently submitted to my meditations, in no way disheartened me. I believed all without difficulty. From that moment my most ardent desire was to be regenerated in the sacred waters of baptism. That happiness was soon to be granted me. I was immediately prepared for this august sacrament, which I received on Christmas Eve. 1826. On this

festival I was likewise admitted to partake of the Blessed Eucharist." Baptized by the Abbé Auger, the sponsors being Baron François de Mallet and the Countess Aglaé-Marie d'Heuze, he took the names of Francis and Mary, to which he added that of Paul, the ardent defender of the Mosaic Law, for whom henceforward he cherished a special devotion. With a heart overflowing with joy, after nearly twenty-three years of moral captivity, he was released from the bondage of Judaism, having overcome all the difficulties that retarded his deliverance. "I cannot sufficiently admire," he says, "the marvelous change which took place in me at the moment the water of baptism was poured upon my forehead. I became truly a new man. All my doubts and fears disappeared in an instant. The ecclesiastical costume, for which I still felt something of that extraordinary repugnance which is characteristic of the Jewish nation, no longer appeared to me under the same aspect. I now felt for it a sentiment of love rather than one of fear. But, above all, I felt an invincible strength and courage to practice the Christian law. I experienced a sort of sweet affection for everything connected with my new belief." To one of his most intimate friends to whom he laid bare his soul he said: "Ah! mon cher, to tell you what I then experienced would be impossible. At the moment the sacred water began to flow on my forehead it seemed to me that I was in another world. I saw myself, as it were, in the middle of an immense globe of fire. I felt as if living no longer an earthly life; I no longer heard or saw anything of what was going on around me; I was led almost mechanically through all the ceremonies which follow baptism." The narrater adds: "Never shall I forget his description of this species of ecstasy, the remembrance of which, after an interval of more than forty years, still presents itself to my mind in all its freshness." Speaking to another fellow-student of his baptism and the exorcisms, he said that he physically felt his deliverance from the spirit of darkness and that he then experienced a violent commotion. "Whilst uttering these words," says the student, "he felt a strong, sensible impression, which, like an electric spark, vividly communicated itself to us all." On leaving the baptismal font he promised the Lord to consecrate himself to His service in the sacred ministry; which shows that, along with other graces, he then received his vocation to the priesthood. But serious obstacles and a severe trial, a cruel cross, were to interpose themselves between the conception of this desire and its fulfillment. He was so backward in Latin and so feeble in body that it was doubtful whether he would be able to endure the mental and physical strain of a long seminary course. Besides, he was entirely without means. Providence, however, provided what

was needful, and through the charity of some pious ladies and the kindness of his directors, the Abbés Auger and Buquet, he got a place in the seminary of the Missions of France, and was tonsured on June 3, 1827, by Mgr. de Quelen, who sent him to St. Sulpice, the house in which he was first placed, having been exclusively founded for the purpose of preparing preachers for the Church of France, a mission to which he did not aspire.

"My entrance into the Seminary of St. Sulpice," he recalls, "was for me an epoch of joys and blessings. The Abbé George, afterwards Bishop of Perigueux, was appointed my 'good angel.' The great charity with which he fulfilled his function edified me extremely, and caused me to love more and more a religion which inspires such sweet and wonderful sentiments." St. Sulpice was then a school of saints. Its inmates breathed an atmosphere of holiness. It was a nursery of sacerdotal vocations, in which were being trained for the service of the Church of France a corps d'élite of future apostolic priests and prelates. Lamennais had not yet fallen, he was still noted for his piety and devotion to the Church, he was still a power for good, and some of his most distinguished disciples were to be found among the Sulpicians. Libermann was in a congenial environment. From the first he was an exemplary seminarist. Continually occupied, from morning till night, in the study of theology, he did not seek the knowledge which inflates, but the science which sanctifies. Like St. Thomas of Aguin, it was before the crucifix he chiefly studied. He gradually came to be the apostle of the seminary. "Have you heard the little Jew speak of the good God?" were the whispered words that passed from mouth to mouth among his fellow-students. "At an early period," says his English biographer, "he heard an interior voice urging him, who could as yet hardly express himself in a new tongue, to speak the language of God. He who seemed to be overwhelmed by his natural timidity and inexperience, who understood his position of a stranger and of a neophyte, had to overlook all that, to treat of spiritual matters, in presence of the friends of Calixte Freze, the disciples of Frayssinous, of De Lammenais or of Father McCarthy. This he did, and with such striking success that he attracted general attention." He drew his knowledge more from meditation than reading, though he was a hard reader. was a type of the interior man. His life was a hidden one. He did not pose as a censor or model. "During five years," he wrote, "I have neither judged nor examined anything." Humility was always his favorite virtue. He received the gift of tears in an eminent degree and a great attraction to the Blessed Sacrament.

It is customary at St. Sulpice for the seminarists to spend half an

hour before the Blessed Sacrament every week. Mgr. Dupont des Loges, who was there in his time and had to draw up the list of adorers, arranged to have Libermann with him during the adoration. "I had every reason to congratulate myself on this innocent expedient," he relates. "How often did I contemplate him at my side, in a sort of ecstasy, his breast heaving with burning sighs, his countenance on fire, his eyes half open and overflowing with silent tears, presenting a picture somewhat similar to that of St. Aloysius at the foot of the altar!" Another of his fellow-students says: "His piety was proverbial amongst us, and there was connected with his person a spirit of holiness and respect which partook of veneration. . . . To express all I feel, when I compare him with those of my good confrères whose piety and virtue have left in me the most salutary impressions, I find none who has surpassed him, none to whom I might have more spontaneously and more truly applied the words, 'He is a saint.'" He was so regarded by all who knew him then. One who occupied a room next to his tells how he "was often awakened in the middle of the night by the sound of the hard strokes of the discipline with which he lacerated his body, already so weakened by sickness." But his heart was still more lacerated by the stern and unbending attitude of his father, who strove by persuasion and intimidation to lead him back to Judaism. "M. Drach, sole confidant of their correspondence," says his biographer, "could not recall to mind, without a feeling of horror, the letters of the frenzied rabbin of Saverne, his imprecations against his Christian sons and his blasphemies against our Divine Redeemer and our holy religion." When the time drew near for his definite breaking with the world by the reception of the sub-deaconship, the letters from home became more and more vehement. One of them was delivered to him during recreation, as customary. He could not peruse it without moistening it with his tears in presence of his fellow-students. They saw him overwhelmed with anguish and unable, amid his sobs, to refrain from uttering these words of the martyrs: "But I am a Christian! I am a Christian!" In a long and very touching reply Libermann gave to his father all the motives of his conversion, established by evident proofs the divinity of the Christian religion and implored him to follow his example with all his family. This letter remained unanswered, and shortly after the heart of the holy seminarist was plunged into the deepest grief by the sad intelligence that his beloved father had died an obstinate Jew.

After he received the four minors at the hands of Mgr. de Quelen, on December 20, 1828, and was on the eve of being promoted to the sub-diaconate, the course seemed clear in front of

476

him, and there was every probability of his being elevated to the priesthood. Though he suffered somewhat from nervous overstrain and was revolving the idea of retiring for a time from the seminary, he remained at St. Sulpice. But the very day before he was to receive the first of the major orders he was stricken with a malady, one of the most painful and distressing known, the cause and cure of which has up to this hour baffled medical science—epilepsy. For ten years he was to remain an epileptic, debarred by this diriment impediment from the priesthood. The Hand which smote Saul of Tarsus on the road to Damascus smote him on his way to the altar; but it is a Hand that smites but to heal, and it entered into the mysterious designs of Providence that he was to bear the burden of this heavy cross for a full decade. He was after receiving his call, passing his examination and making his preparatory retreat when the blow fell. As he was standing in front of the fireplace in the room of his spiritual director the first fit prostrated him. He was stricken with this malady, almost as painful to witness as to endure, exactly at the age—twenty-five—when, ac-

In addition to this physical malady, he had to endure for five years that spiritual malady known as spiritual aridity, an interior sense of bitterness and desolation invading his soul. He carried this twofold cross, this martyrdom of soul and body, in a spirit of perfect resignation. Like the Curé of Ars, he had learned to love his cross, and spoke of epilepsy as "his dear malady." In him, in the words of the Apostle, virtue was made perfect in infirmity. We learn from a letter which, in his humility, he recommended to be burned, that during his seminary course he passed through all the phases of the spiritual life, into states which not only his directors, but even the best mystical treatises did not sufficiently explain.² One of his directors, M. Gallais, did not hesitate to declare publicly that in his opinion there was not a soul in France more advanced in mental prayer than M. Libermann.

cording to Hippocrates, it is usually incurable.

On the 16th of July, 1831, on the festival especially consecrated in the seminary to the priesthood of our Lord, whilst during Mass he was meditating on the mystery of the day, and renewing, no doubt, the humble confession of his unworthiness, the Divine Master, as if to answer his thoughts, deigned to show Himself to him, in a distinct and sensible form, as Supreme Pontiff. He saw the Redeemer, His hands streaming with light and graces, ranging around Him all the students of the seminary, going through their ranks, giving to each one a share of His bountiful gifts, excepting only himself. At the same time our Lord seemed to offer him to his

^{2 &}quot;Life," by Rev. Prosper Goepfert, p. 92.

companions, and, as it were, to place at his disposal the treasures He had distributed to them all. He soon after related this vision to his spiritual director. Another extraordinary fact is related by a lady—one of the witnesses who gave evidence in the process of the Ordinary, for the introduction of the cause of Father Libermann. On the day of her consecration to the Blessed Virgin, while she was assisting at Mass at St. Sulpice, she saw around the head of the seminarist who was attending the priest (M. Faillon) a luminous aureola which was of such brilliancy that she thought for a moment his garments were on fire. She learned afterwards that the young seminarist was Jacob Libermann, a son of the rabbin of Saverne. In after years he became her spiritual director, and as such addressed to her several of his admirable letters of direction.³

To the double cross he was carrying another was added. The revolution of 1830, which led to the dissolution of several charitable associations, scattered a large portion of the funds destined for the education of ecclesiastical students in the Seminary of Paris. Libermann, an orphan and an epileptic, was told he could not be kept. When M. Carbon, with affectionate solicitude, asked him what would become of him: "I cannot return to the world," he replied; "God, I am confident, will provide for my wants." The heads of the seminary were so touched that they revoked their decision and resolved to retain him in their house at Issy.

At this time there used to be an interval of fourteen or fifteen months between one fit and another. But more than once he was stricken down as if by a thunderbolt. On one occasion he nearly lost his life in a violent attack which seized him as he was near the top of the stairs in the philosophers' seminary. The sudden shock might have thrown him backwards and precipitated him downstairs; he saw his danger and uttered a loud cry, which brought to his assistance all the occupants of the adjoining apartments. He was borne to the infirmary in fearful convulsions. As every one who has had any experience of such cases knows, the afflicted ones, after such crises, are subject to a depressing dullness and gloomy morbidity. But when Libermann recovered his senses he recovered his wonted serenity.

"I know," said the doctor who was called to him, "what disturbances such crises produce in all the senses, and even in the innermost part of the soul. I have found him tranquil and almost happy; he must be either an angel or a saint." But he had to purchase such peace of soul at the price of self-conquest. One day as he was passing over a bridge in Paris, in company with a seminarist, who was then in great affliction, he endeavored to console him

³ Op. cit., pp. 95-96.

as best he could, when his companion, more and more disturbed, abruptly said: "It is always very well to give these advices when you are yourself happy and peaceful. It is easy to perceive by your tone and your appearance that you have never passed through such trials." "Ah! mon cher," he replied, "I do not wish you to pass through the painful ordeal through which I have passed. God grant that life may never be such a burden to you as it is to me! I can hardly pass over a bridge without being assailed by the thought of throwing myself into the river, to put an end to my sufferings. But the sight of my Jesus sustains me and gives me patience." And all this time he was enduring a spiritual agony, that state which St. Mary Magdalen of Pazzi described as "the lions' den" and he in turn called "the tomb of Lazarus." For more than four years he was thus morally entombed; all his faculties absorbed, his body broken and weakened, his soul made captive and desolate, his entire being overwhelmed with affliction—an object of repugnance to himself and to others. In the most hidden corners of the Santo Camino or kneeling before the statue of "Our Lady of the Poor" he sought relief in prayer. At length in him were verified the words: "After a storm there cometh a calm, and after tears and weeping Thou pourest in joyfulness."

The cholera epidemic, which afforded the Sulpicians an opportunity of exercising that spirit of apostolic zeal and self-sacrifice which animated them, showed the heroism of the budding saint in Libermann, who was the leader of the corps d'élite chosen to minister to the sick and dying at the risk of their own lives, although Providence did not exact that proof of their devotedness. Another field for the exercise of his zeal was an unobtrusive apostolate in his own family, which extended from 1826 to 1852. After his conversion his thoughts and his heart went out to his parents, relatives and friends and the seven millions of self-deluded Jews who blindly clung to the cerements of a dead past-"lost sheep of the House of Israel." Neither prayers nor persuasions, entreaties or arguments were omitted in his unwearied efforts to convert his father; but this consolation was denied him. He was more successful with other members of his family, and had the happiness of seeing five of his brothers become Catholics and his spiritual brethren. One of his nieces embraced the religious state and died in the odor of sanctity; a nephew and four nieces consecrated themselves to the service of God.

His four years' apostolate among the students in the Issy Seminary (1833-1837) was productive of wonderful results. He revived primitive fervor, the spirit of Olier and De Condren, in the three Sulpician houses of Paris, Issy and La Solitude or the novitiate;

beginning in the porter's lodge, where he first addressed himself to the simplest souls, a few pious servants; then going to the infirmary or assisting newcomers, carrying their trunks, leading them to their rooms, which he swept, or making their beds. Next he gradually acquired an influence over the students, even the most advanced in their studies, uniting the more fervent in an association, which held "pious meetings" for their mutual edification. It was an epoch when an attraction towards scientific research was beginning to display itself, the epoch of Cuvier, who gave so great an impulse to the scientific school he founded. M. Pinault, a recent conquest from the State University, who had been a professor at the Ecole Normale and a member of the Geological Society of Paris, and who had abandoned brilliant prospects to enter the seminary in order to devote himself to the education of aspirants to the priesthood, increased among the students a love of erudition and science. They formed themselves into a select group and on walk-days discussed literature, poetry, philosophy and geology, everything except asceticism and piety, and were called, with a slight tinge of irony, "les scientifiques." Libermann by his conversation diverted their thoughts occasionally to a higher science—the science of the saints. Their professor began to regard his growing influence with uneasiness and suspicion, until one day, by the humility with which he received a public and severe rebuke, he disarmed his distrust and drew from him the observation: "Decidedly, this is either a saint or a superior man, and in either case he must be tolerated." This very professor became his chief cooperator in the reform of the two seminaries of Issy and St. Sulpice. "Believing himself for ever excluded from the priesthood," says his English biographer,4 "he wished at least to animate with the sacerdotal spirit the numerous phalanx of the levites, who were soon to be engaged in the midst of the world in the arduous work of the salvation and sanctification of souls."

In a short time two-thirds of the students at Issy were enrolled in his association. The growing group of talented and fervent young men he gathered round him formed the nucleus of his future congregation. "He possessed," says one of them, "a particular gift for directing souls and helping them to advance on the way of perfection. . . . God had given M. Libermann great and clear lights concerning souls and the interior ways and operations of grace. He would in an instant read a soul through and through; he even seemed to have known it beforehand, and to have derived his knowledge from a kind of inspiration." His influence was so extraordinary that in a single year nearly fifty seminarists entered on the religious life or became missioners in infidel countries.

⁴ Op. cit., p. 141.

His first disciples and cooperators in laying the foundation of a new religious society were Frederic Le Vavasseur and Eugene Tisserand. The former belonged to a family who descended from Jacques Le Vavasseur, a Calvinist, saved, when a child of seven years, by some Catholics from the massacre of St. Bartholomew's day (1572) and who became a member of the true Church and the head of a numerous family who gave many distinguished men to the State, particularly to the legal and military professions. Born on the island of Bourbon in 1811, when it was crowded with Negro slaves, who were reduced to a most degraded condition, he was destined to become the apostle of the blacks. Tisserand, the son of a Creole mother, and descended from a former Governor of San Domingo, was likewise greatly interested in the salvation of the Negroes. The coming together of these three kindred spirits was the genesis of a great work which, later on, became the Congregation of the Holy Ghost and the Holy Heart of Mary. "Two seminarists," says Father Goepfert, "the one rejected from the ecclesiastical state as incapable, the other despairing of being able to pursue his studies, both compelled to rely for their principal chance of success on an indigent acolyte, who, being stricken with a hideous and, in most cases, an incurable malady, was for ten years excluded from holy orders; and even this feeble support was soon to be separated from them and apparently called to another destination. On this triple foundation God will, however, build up a work according to His own heart and in favor of the most destitute souls upon earth."

This simple, suffering, humble acolyte—so humble that he was consumed with the love of abjection and contempt, who loved to be despised and looked upon as a man of no great value—was made master of novices while still only in minor orders. About 1826 Pere Blanchard revived the pious institute which had been founded by Pere Eudes, the first apostle of devotion to the Sacred Heart, but which had been swept away by the destructive torrent of irreligion which flooded France at the time of the great Revolution and which, even yet, has not subsided. When his successor, the Abbé Louis, a Breton priest, applied to St. Sulpice for an auxiliary in directing the novitiate at Rennes, "Take M. Libermann with you," they said; "he is, it is true, only in minor orders, but he is as good as a priest."

His hunger of humiliations was gratified to the full. Having been lifted up, he was cast down. On the 27th of February, 1838, the vigil of the feast of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, the whole community assembled at the hour of Vespers to hear one of its members speak on the richness and goodness of this admirable

Heart. The master of novitiates was unexpectedly requested to give the accustomed conference. As he was beginning to speak, "all at once," writes an eyewitness, "he fell to the ground, struck by a violent attack of epilepsy; and whilst he remained stretched on the pavement before our sorrowing eyes, we witnessed for more than a quarter of an hour all the sad effects of this awful malady. The following night he had to be watched, and he remained for several days under the influence of the attack." It was the last, but the most painful and humiliating. Until the close of 1839 the crises of his malady were less frequent and less painful; in most cases they were but slight faintings. Several considered his infirmity as a trial to preserve in him the spirit of humility, union with God and total abandonment to His will. "Indeed," writes one of his novices, M. Poirier, afterwards Bishop of Roseau and one of the most zealous propagators of the faith in North America, who considered as a special favor of Providence the time he spent with him in the novitiate of the Eudists, "I am in no way surprised that he was delivered from it at the moment appointed by Divine Providence. I even feel convinced that by conferring such a favor on His servant the Lord has wished to give him a pledge of His protection and a sign of His approval of a work undertaken for His glory."

It was before the altar and under the auspices of Our Lady of Victories in the celebrated church in Paris dedicated under that invocation that the first idea of Libermann's society was conceived. There, their hearts throbbing with sympathetic emotion, on the feast of the Purification in 1839 they heard the saintly Abbé Desgenettes recommend for the first time to the prayers of a large congregation the conversion and salvation of the Negro race, an intention they had suggested to the pious pastor. Sown in such soil and in such an atmosphere, the project struck root. New recruits joined their ranks; the number of future missioners increased rapidly; students distinguished by their talents or piety rallied round the promoters, although the founder regarded himself as "a useless vessel in the Church of God . . . a piece of worm-eaten wood, to which the fire takes only stealthily and with difficulty, and that gives neither heat nor light to anybody . . . a paralytic who wishes to move, but cannot," whose "desires are immense, but altogether fruitless." To a seminary director he wrote: "In the utter nothingness in which I am, the only thing left me is to prepare for death." Having spent several months in interior agony at the foot of the cross, he thought of retiring into solitude and living on alms, relying solely on Providence. He took counsel with his former directors, the Paris Sulpicians, but the light he sought was elusive and did not yet fully dawn upon him. It was on the feast of the Apostles SS. Simon and Jude, after a fervent Communion, that for the first time the Lord spoke to his heart in clear tones and that his real vocation revealed itself. He already foresaw that the extraordinary ardor manifested at St. Sulpice for the apostolate of the blacks would soon cool down in many and that the Lord had designed him, poor as he was, to become the founder of a new society of missionaries.⁵

His resoluteness was subjected to the usual tests, such as we find them now and again in religious biographies. When he told the superior of the Eudists, the latter said his idea was an illusion of the devil and an effect of self-love, and a person of eminent virtue, to whom he had confided his secret, censured most severely and treated as imprudent his intention of going to Rome. A lady in Dijon, upon whom he called on his way from Paris to Lyons and who had such a veneration for him that she would write to him only on bended knees, describes his appearance as "in a clean soutane, his head uncovered and bent down," he uttered "some unintelligible words," and "appeared so humble, so recollected, so gentle, so unhappy," that she "felt entirely moved." After laying his cares and intentions at the feet of our Lady in her sanctuary at Fourvières, where he humbly solicited, but was rudely refused, permission to serve Mass, he spent three weeks in Lyons as the guest of the family of the Abbé Ozanam, a former fellow-student at St. Sulpice. When he laid his plan before the superior of a religious community, who received him coldly, he began to laugh heartily, gave him no answer, and abruptly left the room. In a joint letter to his brother and sister he wrote: "I have guitted Rennes. I have no longer on earth a single creature in whom I can confide. have nothing; I do not know what shall become of me, how I shall ever be able to live. I will lead a contemptible, forgotten, neglected life, a life lost according to the world; I will have the disapproval of a great number of those who formerly loved and esteemed me; I shall, perhaps, be treated as a proud and senseless man, be despised and even persecuted. . . . Look on me as a man dead and buried. Pray God for the good of my soul and the accomplishment of His most holy will."

Accompanied by Paul de la Brunière, then a sub-deacon, destined, as a priest of the Seminary of Foreign Missions, to meet a martyr's death at the hands of the long-haired Tartars, he proceeded to Rome, where, along with his companion, he had audience of Gregory XVI. On this occasion took place a remarkable incident, thus related by M. Drach to Father Schwindenhammer: "In furnishing notes of the life of our dear Father Libermann of blessed memory I forgot

⁵ Goepfert, op. cit., p. 215.

a remarkable fact which I discovered in the diary, wherein each evening I note down the chief incidents of the day. On the 17th of February, 1840, I presented to His Holiness Gregory XVI. the Abbé Libermann and his friend, the Abbé de la Brunière. The Sovereign Pontiff laid his hand on the head of the Abbè Libermann and leaned upon it with visible emotion. When the two ecclesiastics had retired, the Pope asked me, in a voice which betrayed his feelings, 'Who is he whose head I have touched?' I gave His Holiness a brief history of the neophyte. The Pope then said these very words: 'Sara un Santo' ('He will be a saint')" In the brief account Libermann himself gave of the audience, which was very short, he says: "His Holiness received me with admirable kindness, bade me persevere, and gave me his blessing. . . . You cannot conceive the great consolation one experiences on seeing the Vicar of our Lord on earth."

When De la Brunière left him to go on the foreign missions, Libermann, we are told, remained at Rome in complete abandonment, feeble in health and reduced to almost extreme poverty, without bread, without clothing, without a friend. Still, he did not lose heart or faith. His faith was of that sterling character that, fire-tried by tribulations, it became the purer, brighter and more unalloyed with any dross of human weakness. When almost insurmountable obstacles barred the way to the realization of his project, he wrote to a friend: "The difficulties to which you refer are great, and may or may not increase in future; but I do not understand how a man with the least atom of faith can put forward such objections. If only easy things should be undertaken, what would have become of the Church? St. Peter and St. John would have continued to fish in the Lake of Tiberias and St. Paul would never have left Jerusalem. I can easily conceive how a man who thinks himself something and who relies on his own strength may stop before an obstacle; but how can any one be frightened by a difficulty when he depends solely on our Adorable Master?" Without a counsellor or protector, persons were far from favoring his views. Some spoke of his project as "an absurdity," others called him "the imprudent solicitor," while a Breton priest frankly told him that it was "a chimerical illusion," reprimanded him for his temerity and tried to free him from "his pretension to become a founder." To the question, "Do you know what it is to found a religious order, being, as you are, in so wretched a condition?" he simply replied by asking what did St. Ignatius Loyola possess when he laid the foundations of his institute? "He had only his

⁶ Letter dated Rome, 10th August, 1855, quoted by Father Goepfert, op. cit., p. 235.

bag and his discipline, and see how his society flourishes. Is not Providence the same to-day as it was then? Depending upon it, I am rich enough." He consulted a priest who was then held in high repute of sanctity throughout the Pontifical States; this priest, cold and reserved, listened inattentively, and as soon as he had finished stood up, and, without uttering a word, left him. A celebrated ecstatica of the Tyrol, to whom he wrote, never replied. He laid before Mgr. Cadolini, Secretary of the Propaganda, a memoir or exposition of his project. The reply which reached him eight days afterwards was that before any definite decision could be given he should be a priest. His position appeared hopeless. Repulsed in Rome, he was reviled in France. He was accused of going to Rome to deceive the Pope, that he might be promoted to holy orders. Even his confessor went so far as to forbid him to speak any further of his project. Still his confidence in God was unshaken; while he devoted himself to meditation, good works, the practice of virtues to the heroic degree, ardent and continual prayer, poverty to the extent of mendicity, mortification of body and spirit, visits to hospitals and prisons, the catechising of poor children and the like. He lived in a little garret, quite under the roof of the humble house of M. Patriarca, in the Vicolo del Pinaco. It was so near the tiles that he could not stand erect in it: a lumber room. where peasants coming into Rome to sell their wares would occasionally pass the night, it being divided into two compartments. A few pigeons were its only constant visitors. For the use of this comfortless loft he paid a crown a month. Giving up one of the compartments to his visitors, the pigeons, he reserved for himself the worse of the two, which he furnished with a chair, a table and a mattress laid on the floor and covered with a single blanket. A stone was his pillow. His crucifix, with which he never parted, he placed upon the table, and on the wall he hung a picture of St. Francis of Assisi. He had to make his own bed, brush his own clothes and shoes and keep his room or attic in order. His dietary was in keeping with these poor surroundings, what was barely sufficient to keep body and soul together. After a light breakfast he partook at midday of a single meal at the common table, contenting himself with the humble fare of the poor people who rented the house. A small quantity of bread usually sufficed for his supper. He was so poor that he often was not able to pay the postage of the letters he received from France on spiritual matters. More than once he had to mix among the poor, to receive the soup which every evening was distributed at the doors of certain religious communities. On one occasion the Abbé Ozanam, penetrating into his little room under the rafters, found him suffering from fever, stretched on a mattress, having only his one blanket to cover him. Beside him was a vessel of water, in which he moistened some crusts of bread. The visitor was so struck by this sight that thirty years afterwards he remembered it vividly. The only visits he paid were to his friend and former catechist, M. Drach, like himself the son of a Jewish rabbin, and who was then librarian of Propaganda.

Such was his belief and trust in Providence that when there was seemingly not the least prospect of success, when he had not the least idea under whose patronage his disciples would exercise their apostolate, when he did not even presume to solicit the establishment of a missionary congregation, he was already deeply interested in the welfare of his as yet unformed spiritual family and felt irresistibly impelled to draw up rules for their guidance. It was when visiting the seven great Roman basilicas and the principal sanctuaries of our Lady in search of light, for as yet he was like one walking and working in a mist, that the thought suddenly struck him "that he should consecrate his work to the Holy Heart of Mary." "Like a luminous ray," says his English biographer, "it flashed across his mind, and in an instant revealed to him a world of light, devotion and confidence. Darkness and indecision had disappeared; he had found the rallying point, and he perceived in one distinct glance the whole plan of the rules in all its extent and details. His soul overflowed with ineffable delight, and it was then that he traced these first lines that adorn the frontispiece of the rules of the new institute and that will ever remain one of its most cherished mottoes: 'All for the greater glory of our Heavenly Father in Jesus Christ, through the Divine Spirit and in union with the most holy Heart of Mary.' M. Libermann had found the name of his society, and from that moment he experienced no difficulty in writing, classifying and explaining the rules for the 'Missionaries of the Holy Heart of Mary."

He spent the whole summer of 1840 writing the rules⁷ and the "Great Commentary"⁸ as well as his "Commentary on the Gospel of St. John." Some of his first followers, not having his strong faith, did not share his firm confidence; several, discouraged by difficulties, gave up the project. For these defections he was consoled by the Pope's paternal encouragement, conveyed to him in a letter from Cardinal Fransoni, Prefect of Propaganda, who assigned as episcopal protector of the nascent congregation, Mgr. Allen Collier, Vicar Apostolic of the Mauritius, a distinguished member of

⁷ His first rule differed little from that of regulars who have no solemn vows or from that mitigated form which governs most modern congregations.

⁸ The latter work is lost.

the English branch of the Order of St. Benedict. Having finished his rules towards the end of autumn, he left Rome in November, 1840, on foot, half-clad, his clothes not having been renewed for a long time. His cloak was composed of many patches, without any regard to quality, shape or color, roughly kept together by means of pins and threads, as best he could. In a letter to a friend he calls himself "a very poor man, both physically and morally. My outward appearance," he wrote, "is so miserable that several times during my travels I was taken for a malefactor and on the point of being cast into prison. All in and about me is common and repulsive." During a pilgrimage to Loreto his strongly marked Jewish face, emaciated by suffering, exposed him to many insults. Some one having secretly ripped up all the old pieces of his mantle, he had to hurriedly re-sew them or replace them by others still more incongruous. Children hooted him as soon as he made his appearance in every village in this patchwork garb. In more than one town the police had to interfere. To avoid incarceration as a suspicious vagrant he had to produce his papers for their inspection. In trudging through the lonesome valleys of Umbri towards Spoleto he narrowly escaped falling into the hands of prowling brigands. For all these humiliations and sufferings he was compensated by the happiness of kneeling in the Holy House of Nazareth, which his Jewish ancestors, his tribe, his family, perhaps, had gazed upon eighteen hundred years before. "The strength which he needed for the labors of his life," says Father Goepfert, "was communicated to him in the workshop of St. Joseph, and the light which he required streamed upon him in abundance through the window of the Angel Gabriel."

It is related that one evening, in the neighborhood of Assisi, he left the main road to visit the tomb of a saint, held in great veneration in that district. Entering a village at a rather late hour, cold, hungry and weary, he went from house to house asking for a night's lodging. Every door was pitilessly closed against him. Continuing his way along the road, he discerned a dim light from an humble solitary cottage. There he was received with great kindness, though its charitable inmates were in deep affliction. A little daughter, suffering acute pain, seemed at the last extremity; her shrieks were most piteous. Her afflicted parents were almost in despair, when the holy stranger, moved with compassion, said to them: "My good people, you do not know what to do; have confidence in God and in His saints. I have just come from the pilgrimage of 'the saint,' and I have brought with me the grains of a tree which grows quite near her tomb. Put some of these grains into a glass of water and give it to your child to drink." "For eight days," replied the father, "she has been unable to swallow the least thing, even water." However, in obedience to the advice, the good man, with a lively faith, hastened to present to the sufferer a glass of water thus prepared. "Leave it to me," said the servant of God. "You have faith; one drop is sufficient;" and, dipping his fingers in the water, he simply moistened the child's lips. At once the pains disappeared; the little patient slept soundly all night, and when, on the morrow, the saint set out on his journey he left the little child entirely restored and her parents filled with joy and gratitude.

On his return to Rome a letter from his brother conveyed to him the joyful news that Mgr. de Ræs, the then recently nominated coadjutor of Mgr. de Tréverne, Bishop of Strasburg, was willing to ordain him sub-deacon. Having entered Rome on the feast of the Epiphany, January 6, 1840, he guitted it on the 7th of the same month in the following year, with the firm determination of becoming a priest and of devoting his life to God and to the salvation of souls through the future Society of the Holy Heart of Mary. He received the sub-diaconate during the ember days of Trinity (5th Tune, 1841) and was ordained deacon on the feast of the Martyr St. Laurence (10th August). On Saturday, the 18th of September, 1841, the ceremony which gave to the Church one of the holiest priests of our age took place in the private chapel of the episcopal palace at Amiens, the Abbé de Brandt being the Bishop's solitary assistant. That very day he wrote a joint letter to his brother and sister, prefaced with the words "Misericordias Domini in æternum cantabo!" in which he communicated to them the glad intelligence. "I have to announce to you," he said, "the great mercy and ineffable bounty of our Lord Jesus Christ towards an unworthy servant, who does not deserve even to pronounce His holy name. I have been ordained priest this morning. God only knows what I have received on this great day! For it cannot be conceived either by man or angel." On the feast of the Apostle St. Matthew he said his first Mass in the house of his benefactresses, the Sisters of Louvencourt. His priestly blessing descended on adopted orphans, images, says his biographer, of the abandoned souls, which were now more than ever the portion of his inheritance. On the following Saturday, after a new thanksgiving of three days, he celebrated his second Mass at the altar of Notre Dame des Victoires, assisted by the saintly M. Desgenettes and surrounded by M. M. Le Vavasseur, Tisserand and Collin. This was the first community Mass of the Society of the Holy Heart of Mary, which thus sprang up where it was first conceived, before the altar and under the auspices of Our Lady of Victories. To all who assisted at the Mass he seemed

more an angel than a man; yet he told M. Drach that he very often ascended the altar "with trembling."

On the 27th of September, 1841, the novitiate was opened at the village of La Neuville with three members, two priests, Libermann and Frederick Le Vavasseur, and a sub-deacon, Marcellin Collin. They lived in the practice of the strictest poverty, subsisting almost exclusively on alms. As happens when truly spiritual men band themselves together for any work, entered upon in utter self-forgetfulness and self-abnegation, the devil, who is ever intent upon thwarting good, raises up opposition. Libermann had hardly been ordained when the Bishop of Amiens, Mgr. Mioland, was besieged by visitors who told him that he had been deceived; that he had imposed hands upon an adventurer of doubtful doctrine and changeable disposition, who pursued at random every sort of good work, and under cover of the priesthood carried on a long series of intrigues at Rome, Paris and Strasburg; that he had opened his diocese to a rash and dangerous enterprise, which would create widespread scandal and confusion. He was perplexed and was on the point of writing to M. Carbon at St. Sulpice, when it chanced that one of the directors, on his way from Boulogne to Paris, visited him. He told him all about his uneasiness, whereupon M. Mollevant said: "My Lord, it is the noblest deed of your life."

At first things looked like failure. For two years they were left alone. At the close of 1843 they only numbered twelve, including one in the Mauritius. But they doubled their numbers from 1843 to the end of 1844. Though their numbers increased, their resources did not increase. Still poor, they had to buy their own provisions at the village or town and draw water from a neighboring fountain. They literally "took no thought of the morrow" and cast their care upon Providence. It never failed them.

From the beginning Libermann was most desirous of seeing the rule strictly observed. He set the example, being, as his biographer calls him, the living rule of his community. He insisted especially on the spirit of interior life, the spirit of sacrifice and on the virtues of charity, zeal and humility. No virtue was dearer to him than charity. He assisted with special care those who were tempted or afflicted, his kindness for scrupulous souls being often carried to heroism. He had the gift of reading consciences and knew the interior state of a soul by infused light. He has been frequently compared to St. Francis de Sales, on account of the gentle manner with which he conducted souls to God.

As the congregation expanded, so did its work. Missions were confided to it in the Mauritius, Bourbon, Hayti, Australia, Guiana and Africa. They were summoned to take their share in the gigantic

work of evangelizing eight hundred millions of souls in the vast field of Catholic missions, calling to their aid "coadjutor brothers."

A further development of the society meanwhile took place in France. In 1844 was established the "House of the Holy Heart of Mary" at Noyon, in the suburbs of Amiens. Another branch house was founded at Bordeaux, at the request of M. Germainville, the well-known apostle of the soldiers, who, with his characteristic earnestness, entreated that his "dear friends of the barracks" and the poor workingmen of France should be looked upon with the same zealous eye as the forsaken black races of Africa. The acquisition of Notre Dame du Gard, formerly in the possession of the Cistercians till the great French Revolution, enabled Libermann to establish the senior scholasticate and the novitiate of the coadjutor brothers.

In 1848 it was incorporated in the restored Society of the Holy Ghost, the two forming one body, under the title of the Congregation of the Holy Ghost and of the Holy Heart of Mary, in virtue of a decree of Propaganda, Father Libermann being appointed first superior general, an office he held down to his death in 1852.

One of the first fruits of his zeal in the high office to which he had been raised was to procure the erection of bishoprics in the islands of Martinique, Guadaloupe and Bourbon, thus solving a difficult problem, one which had baffled all the efforts of his predecessors—the constitution of the colonial clergy. "Of all the evils which afflict the Church in the French colonies," he wrote to Cardinal Fransoni, "the abuse of power on the part of the Governors appears to me to be the greatest. Ecclesiastical authority is weakened, paralyzed and degraded. The priests are considered as mere Government officials and the influence of evil authority over them is all-powerful. The ordinance which obliges ecclesiastical superiors to give to the temporal power an account of the conduct of their clergy needs no comment, as it carries its spirit within itself." To remedy this entailed a great amount of labor. "During several months," he said afterwards, "I have lived the life of a galley slave, but it was necessary to take a little trouble for these poor colonies." In this he showed he was not only an exemplary priest, but a skillful negotiator and able administrator.

It being impossible to personally direct each missioner, he composed for the guidance of all his subjects his "Instructions to the Missioners." He was instrumental, after his arrival in Paris, of starting an ecclesiastical conference under the patronage of St. John the Evangelist, composed of priests for their mutual help and edification in the exercise of the ministry. Both he and his priests had the direction of several religious communities. When M. le Pré-

vost, founder of the Brothers of St. Vincent de Paul, was about establishing in Paris in 1851 an institution for the education of the orphans of the working classes, he consulted Libermann. "We never left him," he said, "without carrying away some new light on the spiritual life, without especially being penetrated by a more lively desire of consecrating ourselves, soul and body, to the service of God in works of zeal and charity." Libermann likewise welcomed and encouraged the Little Sisters of the Poor on their arrival in Paris, aided them liberally by his alms and sent them his priests to act as chaplains. He never ceased to bestow the most assiduous care on the "Œuvre de la Sainte Famille," which in those revolutionary times rendered immense service in one of the most illreputed quarters. Despite his many occupations, he would never refuse admittance to any one; "for who knows," he would say, "if it is not God who sends me these souls?" The Seminary of the Holy Ghost was, in the centre of Paris, a focus of charity and apostolic zeal, and a shelter constantly open to every class—to soldiers, apprentices, workmen, orphans, in a word, to all who stood⁹ in need of spiritual or corporal succor.

The seminary also gradually became the rallving centre to which were drawn the most lettered among the French clergy, men who subsequently became distinguished either by their exalted virtues or positions or their contributions to sacred science and Catholic literature. "Yet," says Mgr. Freppel, "nothing was more remote from the mind of the venerable Libermann than the desire of playing any part whatsoever in the affairs of the Church. But God, who delights in exalting the humble, was pleased to honor His servant in proportion to his humility. Around him gathered that indefatigable writer who has had the merit of restoring the true principles of history, by proving that the Catholic Church is the beginning and end of the movement of all ages;10 that illustrious Cardinal¹¹ who, despite the still prevailing Jansenistic severities, secured complete triumph for the wise teachings of the greatest moral theologian of modern times;12 that learned Benedictine13 who, before assuming the purple, shed such new lustre on the glories of French learning; that canonist, as humble as he was learned, whose numerous writings have redressed so many errors."14

In a chapter of the English biography Father Goepfert gives an illuminative analysis of his writings and doctrines in which he is

⁹ Goepfert, p. 430.

¹⁰ The Abbé Rohrbacher.

¹¹ Cardinal Gousset, Archbishop of Reims.

¹² St. Alphonsus Liguori.

¹³ Cardinal Pitra, author of many learned works, who wrote the first French biography of Libermann.

¹⁴ The Abbé Dominic Bouix.

shown to have been a consummate master of the spiritual life. In three treatises on "The Interior Life," on "Mental Prayer" and "Affective Mental Prayer," he treated these difficult points as a profound theologian, as a sound ascetic, in a word, as a saint who only describes the paths which he has trodden himself. "Whilst reading with respectful amazement over the numerous autograph writings of the venerable servant of God," says Father Goepfert, "we could not refrain from having the desire to see all his works soon published and take their place by the side of the works of St. Francis de Sales or St. Alphonsus Liguori." 16

He possessed in a high degree that science which is superior to all human science—the science of the saints. This science is embodied in his spiritual letters. The arrival of a letter from Father Libermann was an event among the seminarists, who disputed for the leaves and sometimes for the pieces. Copies, collections and extracts were made, which crossed the seas, to console and strengthen missioners to the farthest extremities of the earth. Many, especially those treating of Christian, religious and sacerdotal perfection, were carefully collected and edited in lithographed copies, for the special use of members of his institute. Yielding to pressing solicitations, his disciples have published two volumes of these letters.¹⁷ Priests who had any of them in their possession regarded them "as a sacred deposit," which they piously preserved, and novice mistresses in convents found them of the greatest assistance "in the interior formation of souls." "Among the servants of God for whom I cherish a special devotion," writes a Dominican Father, "the venerable Libermann holds one of the first places. This devotion sprang up within me whilst reading his life, and it increased whilst perusing his letters. Few readings have done me as much good as these letters. I found in them the high strengthening doctrine of M. Olier, with all the unction and simplicity of St. Bonaventure." Cardinal Donnet, Archbishop of Bordeaux, wrote of them in a letter to the superior general: "They are the work of a saint very advanced in spirituality. . . . Father Libermann depicts himself in his writings. He reveals to us a beautiful soul entirely united to God and desirous, above all, to bring after him all those to whom he addresses himself. . . . His letters are real treatises on spiritual devotion."

He accomplished a great work in a short time. "In a few years,"

¹⁵ Biog., p. 440.

¹⁶ Op. cit., p. 443.

^{17 &}quot;Lettres Spirituelles du Vénérable Libermann," two vols. in 8vo., xiv.-688-679 pp. Paris: Librairie Poussielque Frèrés, Rue Cassette, 27. Many letters have been lost. His letters date back to his conversion and during the twelve years he remained in minor orders.

says his English biographer, "he sowed the seed of every virtue in the souls of thousands of levites, religious, priests and apostles in particular; he endowed the Church with a religious society, established many houses and missions, promoted the erection of three Vicariates Apostolic and of three bishoprics, sent his missioners to the most desolate regions of the earth and peopled heaven with his disciples and the souls saved by their apostolic labors." 18

Having worked while there was light, there came to him, as to all, the night time when man can work no longer. The laborer had to quit the field which he had tilled and sown and where he reaped an abundant harvest. "Provided I live for ten years," he said to one of his disciples in 1842, "I ask no more, and I feel certain that it will be so." "Have you had any revelation to that effect?" was the query. "I have felt something like an interior voice, which gave me this assurance," was the response. It was while visiting Notre Dame du Gard, on the 3d of December, 1851, he was seized with his last illness. After Christmas he recovered sufficient strength to be able to go to Paris, there, says Father Goepfert, to sanctify by his last sufferings and holy death the mother house of his religious family. Among the numerous visitors were M. Desgenettes, Rohrbacher, Ravignan and Augustin Cochin, the great pulpit orator saying to the last named: "Come with me; let us go and see how saints die." He suffered a martyrdom, the intensity of his pains betraying itself in frequent exclamations, such as "Humanly speaking, it is insupportable!" "O, my God! Oh! how I suffer! What a martyrdom!" His death took place on the 2d of February, 1852, feast of the Purification, which is also that of the Presentation of Jesus in the Temple, while the community were chanting in the chapel the vespers of the feast and had just intoned the verse of the "Magnificat:" Deposuit potentes de sede, et exaltavit humilesthe words being distinctly audible in the room of the dying founder. Father Le Vavasseur afterwards closed his eyelids during the "Gloria Patri." Father Schwindenhammer, whom he had designated as his successor, notes the appropriate coincidence of the Purification and the day, Monday, being the day consecrated to the Holy Ghost, "thus uniting more closely," he says, "the two branches that constitute our society, as well as the two devotions which should be the object of our special worship." They laid him to rest, as he wished, within the enclosure of Notre Dame du Gard in an humble vault hewn out at the foot of the cemetery cross, the place of his sepulture being marked by a modest monument.

R. F. O'CONNOR.

Cork, Ireland.

¹⁸ Op. cit., p. 454.

TALLEYRAND'S CONVERSION.

II.

ALLEYRAND was soon to discover that his marriage was one of the greatest mistakes of a life which—despite the judgment of the world to the contrary—was fruitful in extraordinary degree of mistakes and of things worse than mistakes. M. De Lacombe says that he entered into formal union with Madame Grand "to put an end to scandal, and the scandal was redoubled; he thought to escape from a false position and he chained himself to it forever." That Napoleon had a considerable share in leading him into the sin and folly which he committed is unquestionable. The First Consul, however disregardful he might be himself of the laws of personal morality, realized perfectly well that the relations which every one believed to exist between the ex-Bishop of Autun and Madame Grand were an outrage against all the canons of public and private decency. In his masterful fashion he sought to end an intolerable condition of things by pretending to think that the Pope had really left Talleyrand free to marry. That he did not actually believe anything of the kind is proved by the fact that—when he became Emperor and set up his Imperial Court—he refused to receive Madame Grand at the Tuilleries. M. De Lacombe says that "Talleyrand soon recognized his mistake. The world was hard upon him. Those who loved him were grieved; his old mother shed tears. Seeing the bad effect produced, the First Consul forgot the day after the marriage that on the eye he had pushed his Minister into it. He always treated Madame Talleyrand coldly, often 'rudely.' It is said that when she appeared at the Tuilleries as a bride1 for the first time he met her with this greeting: 'I hope the good conduct of Citovenne Talleyrand will cause the levity of Madame Grand to be forgotten.' Putting on an ingenuous air, she replied: 'On that point I cannot do better than to follow the example of Citovenne Bonaparte.' The First Consul, who did not like receiving lessons, turned away with angry eyes. From the very first he tried to keep her away from court by his affronts, and at last, as Emperor, her access to it. When Pius VII. came to Paris in 1804 he expressly stipulated that Madame de Tallevrand was not to be presented to him; and there was a new crop of sarcasms in the court and all over the town."2

Talleyrand pretended to take no notice of the evidences daily forthcoming that the public regarded his so-called marriage as null

¹ This refers to the Consular receptions.

^{2 &}quot;Talleyrand the Man," p. 184.

and void and as being simply a scandal the more. To the world he maintained an imperturbable calm, even while his heart must have been filled with anxieties and his mind with doubts. In her memoirs Madame de Rémusat says of him at this time:

"He tried to escape from the bitterness of his thoughts by an absolutely artificial life. Public affairs helped him by giving him occupation, and such time as they left on his hands he spent at the gaming table. Always surrounded by a numerous court, he gave his mornings to business, his evenings to the theatre and his night to cards, never exposing himself to a tedious 'tête-à-tête' with his wife, or to the dangers of a solitude which would have afforded an opportunity for too serious reflection. Ever seeking distraction, he never sought sleep until he had insured it by extreme fatigue."

The life led by Talleyrand and his so-called wife at this time was, regarded from a sane or Catholic standpoint, absolutely ridiculous. It was, however, a part of the scheme which Napoleon had formed of creating the semblance of a new aristocracy and making Paris again a centre of gaiety, luxury and extravagance. All the higher members of the civil and military services were paid gigantic salaries on, however, the distinct understanding that they were to spend them in splendid living. The First Consul and future Emperor had fully grasped the truth that money distributed by the State in this way, while keeping the people contented by remunerative employment, eventually flows back to the national coffers through various channels, that provided by the tax-gatherers being not the least productive of revenue. M. De Lacombe says that: "In her amusing journal Madame de Cazenove d'Arleus, a very witty woman, whose brother-in-law had a post in the Ministry, has described an evening party to which she was invited on the 16th of February, 1803, as she was passing through Paris. There was a line of carriages in the Rue du Bac; the courtyard of the Hotel Galliffet was full to overflowing; every one had to wait their turn to advance. One arrived at last; went up the wide staircase bright with flowers and lights, which quite dazzled. M. de Talleyrand, calm and very pale, in a suit of red velvet embroidered in gold, received the guests in the first salon. Further on, Madame de Talleyrand, 'tall, beautiful and well dressed, awaited their homage. All the Ambassadors resident in Paris, all the princes and princesses, all the women who wished to keep a footing in that circle, passed in and out and bowed themselves down. The men in embroidered suits, wearing their orders; the women in velvet, a good deal of white satin and dresses of white crêpe, others in black lace; quantities of diamonds.' The feature of the evening

was the apparition of the Envoy of Tunis, 'a tall man in a turban, with very black moustache, a gray robe, trimmed with ermine over embroidered red trousers. He passed through the double line of stars, orders and bedizened coats, prostrating himself, until he reached Madame de Talleyrand.' Such evenings were not rare at Talleyrand's house. So long as the Empire lasted, whether he was in favor or in disgrace, Minister, Vice Grand Elector or Grand Chamberlain, his salons always exercised the same attraction; the notabilities of the whole world passed through them, as through a gigantic magic lantern." When Napoleon created the ex-Bishop of Autun Prince de Bénèvent and Madame Grand called herself Princess de Bénèvent, the same kind of thing was continued, but on a still more lavish and magnificent scale. Moreover, the illassorted couple gave countless private dances and card parties, to which only their most intimate friends were invited. Both lived in a perfect whirlwind or whirlpool of gaiety and social dissipation. Talleyrand's main thought was to escape from thought.

M. De Lacombe points out that through all his metamorphoses Talleyrand remained a man of former times. As a dignitary of the Empire he retained the flavor of those precious evenings when as Abbé de Périgord he had achieved a sudden reputation by a few witty words. He was an unrivaled talker, he knew how to speak of serious things lightly and competently, evoke memories, tell anecdotes, set the spark to a train of wit. "If M. de Talleyrand's conversation could be bought, I should ruin myself on it!" said Madame de Stäel while they were still friends. A charmed circle often gathered round him in the evening, with Madame de Tallevrand at the head. She sat bolt upright in her armchair, rather stiff and awkward in her gorgeous array, her hair wreathed with flowers even when she was growing old. She did not speak much. Her husband's lady friends treated her almost as an intruder. There were to be seen the Duchesse de Luynes, and the Princesse de Vaudemont, the Vicomtesse de Laval, Aimée de Coigny, first Duchesse de Fleury, and then Madame de Montrond; later on Madame de Rémusat, trying 'by the sweat of her brow' to say something witty; Madame de Flahaut, later on Madame de Souza, a charming Italian lady, gay and learned; a Polish lady with a glass eve, which made her profile look strange; the Comtesse Tyskiewitz, sister of the famous cavalry soldier, Prince Poniatowski. These and such as these would greet Madame de Talleyrand when they arrived and when they left, that was all. If Talleyrand kept silence or sat down to the whist table the conversation languished, and the poor Princesse de Bénèvent, who took no interest in anything but the weather, questions of etiquette and genealogical prob-

lems, was not capable of reviving it. But her salon was always crowded, and she was happy. That the poor woman was very grand looking all authorities appear to be agreed. Unfortunately, they are equally unanimous in describing her as being extremely unintellectual and almost uneducated. It is, perhaps, only charitable to ascribe her many errors as much to these defects as to deliberate rejection of the law of God. Her deathbed repentance almost seems to justify this view. Long before this event, however, she had been completely separated from Talleyrand. The poor Princesse—if she can properly be given the title—was absolutely reckless as regards her good name; scandalous gossip arose; and there were constant domestic dissensions. Besides, with the dawn of the Restoration a continuance of the alliance between the ill-assorted pair became an impossibility, if only because of the fact that, while Louis XVIII. desired to retain the matchless diplomatic skill of Tallevrand in the service of the State, the latter was equally and honestly desirous of serving France. Never were his talents exercised more effectively than at the Congress of Vienna, wheresupported by Castlereagh, who represented England—he secured for the envoy of the Pope the position of president of the deliberations and eventually the restoration to the Holy See of the temporal sovereignty of the States of the Church. There was not, however, and there could not possibly be any room found at the royal court for the so-called "wife" of the ex-Bishop of Autun. If the thing had been even remotely possible, the satiric papers of Paris were determined to make it impossible. Paragraphs of the most offensive kind were published. A specimen of these may be quoted. This was printed as if it were an item of genuine fashionable intelligence:

"Paris, 6th May, 1816.—Yesterday after Mass the Bishop of Autun had the honor of presenting his wife to the son of St. Louis."

The jibe was a very blackguard one, but it is necessary to quote it in order to show how Paris—always cynical—regarded both its Sovereign and his Minister for Foreign Affairs. After Waterloo and the final overthrow of Napoleon, when both Louis XVIII. and Talleyrand were once more reëstablished in the capital, the latter realized that the continuance of his crazy alliance was impossible. It was a scandal against public propriety which Catholic opinion—then dominant at court—would not tolerate. Under these eircumstances, he installed his niece, Comtesse Edmond de Perigord, as head of his household, across the threshold of which that lady registered solemn vows Madame Grand should never pass. So far as the latter was concerned, the arrangement of a separation was entirely a matter of money. She knew perfectly well that

Talleyrand's main purpose was to keep her out of Paris, where her presence made him contemptible and ridiculous. The Comtesse wanted her permanently exiled to England, but eventually it was agreed as a compromise that she should fix her residence at Pontdes-Sains, Talleyrand allowing her a generous annuity. In 1817, however, she could stand quietude no longer and suddenly appeared in Paris. Talleyrand was both annoyed and puzzled, but he was resolved to avoid anything in the nature of a public quarrel. Accordingly, he consented to continue the annuity, if she refrained from creating any further scandal. At first she rented a villa in the suburbs at Auteuil, but eventually settled down in a house in the Rue de Lille. Here she set up a kind of salon of her own, entertaining from time to time various notabilities, French, English, Irish and Americans. One of her numerous guests, for example, was Tom Moore. In the matter of servants, furniture, equipage, etc., the income provided by Talleyrand enabled her to maintain the state befitting the title of Princesse de Bénèvent. The armorial bearings of the Talleyrands were blazoned on all the fittings of the mansion, but from her so-called husband she was as completely separated as if a decree of divorce had legally annulled the marriage, which was no marriage. At the same time the grace of God was working a miracle in her heart and soul.

We must let M. De Lacombe tell the story: "On Monday, the 7th of December, 1835, the Archbishop of Paris, Mgr. de Quélen, was giving audience in the parlor of the Dames de Saint Michel, in the Rue Saint Jacques, whose convent was his favorite retreat since the pillage of his episcopal palace and of his chateau at Conflans. It was about 6 o'clock in the afternoon. All at once he was informed that a lady insisted on seeing him, and that it was a case of a sick call. The Archbishop interrupted his audience; the lady entered; she was the Duchesse d'Esclignac, née Talleyrand-Périgord.3 She explained hastily that her aunt, the Princesse de Talleyrand, was dying and wished to make her confession. There was not a moment to lose; the doctors did not think that she could last the night. Mgr. de Ouélen did not hesitate; his apostolic zeal is well known; he often used to say: 'I would go a hundred miles to save a soul.' Although he was holding his council at that moment, he got into the Duchesse d'Esclignac's carriage with his two Grand Vicars, Abbé Quentin and Abbé Affre,4 and drove to the Rue de Lille. The interview between Mgr. de Quélen and Madame de Tallevrand was very touching. As soon as the Archbishop came

³ She was the daughter of Baron Boson de Talleyrand-Périgord, the second brother of Talleyrand.

⁴ Assassinated afterwards, when Archbishop of Paris.

into the room the invalid raised herself upon her pillows with murmured thanks and immediately made her confession with grave simplicity. Then she asked that her friends and servants, who had withdrawn into the next room, should be called back; these were the Duchesse d'Esclignac, the Comtesse de Champeron, the Marquise de Vins de Pezac, the Abbés Affre and Quentin and her two lady's-maids. As soon as they had taken their places round her bed she said in a voice which was still firm: 'I am glad to be reconciled with God, and, after asking His pardon, I beg pardon of men for any scandal I have caused.' All present were moved and kept silence. Mgr. de Quélen sent the Abbé Quentin to the parish Church of St. Thomas Aquinas for the Viaticum and holy oils. Presently the Princesse, who had fallen back breathless on her pillow, asked for the Archbishop once more; she wished to speak to him in private. First she questioned him as to her condition, and as he only replied with vague encouragements, she understood the truth. Showing no sign of trouble, she sent her lady companion for two caskets, one of wood, the other of red morocco, locked and tied up with white silk ribbon and sealed in wax with her arms. When they were in the Archbishop's hands she said: 'If I get well, you will give them back to me; if not, give them to the Duchesse d'Esclignac.' She also gave him a sum of 2,000 francs in bank notes for the poor. Mgr. de Quélen asked her to devote it to the charity of the cholera orphans, and she consented. Then she begged him twice over that he would himself recommend all those in her service to M. de Talleyrand. Meanwhile the Abbé Quentin and the curé of Saint Antoine had arrived. The Princesse was left to recollect herself for a few moments. Then Mgr. de Quélen, showing her the Host, exhorted her to piety, resignation and confidence; he administered the Viaticum and Extreme Unction and recited the prayers for the dying."5 At 9 o'clock that night the Archbishop left the house. Madame de Talleyrand lived two days longer, but peacefully expired in the early morning of the 10th of December, 1835.

That same morning the Duchesse de Dino, hearing that the Princesse was in her agony, thought it right to acquaint Talleyrand with the fact. Imperturbable as ever, he answered in words which the Duchesse, not unnaturally, has recorded "surprised" her. The reply was significant while callous. It was: "This simplifies my position very much." More than a year before—in the autumn of 1834—Talleyrand had consented at last to admit that his years were so many he might without discredit claim a spell of earthly repose. He retired from the public service in a veritable blaze of

⁵ "Talleyrand the Man," pp. 209, 210, 211.

glory. As Ambassador for France at the Court of St. James he had brought about the actual accomplishment of the dream he had dreamt forty years before, in the days of his visionary republicanism, and established a genuine alliance between his own country and Great Britain. "He had done more; thanks to him, the independence of Belgium, the safeguard of the northern frontier, had been recognized. And he had just signed the Treaty of the Quadruple Alliance, which, by binding together France, England, Spain and Portugal in favor of the Peninsular, seemed, in the words of Mignet, to oppose the union of the West to that of the North in the interests of the great constitutional cause on the Continent. The veteran diplomatist seemed like its arbitrator."6 Talleyrand had labored, and labored successfully, to set the stamp of the principles of the Revolution on the public conscience of Europe. Henceforth the decision of a mere brute majority—nicknamed "Constitutionalism"—was to reign supreme. The nations which had sacrificed and suffered most in resisting by force of arms the doctrines of 1792 were at last cajoled by this extraordinary old man into giving them peaceful acceptance. The effects of his achievement are still visible in a lowering of the moral tone of the whole Continent. Whether or not Talleyrand and the statesmen of various nations who yielded to his wiles ever realized the inevitable result of their proceedings would be impossible to decide without entering upon an investigation too large for us. We must cor.tent ourselves with merely noting facts. As M. De Lacombe puts it: "Talleyrand felt weary, ill and infirm. His withered legs. could not support him; he was subject to palpitations and fainting fits; sometimes when speaking or walking he was obliged to stop short to take breath. He suffered from that incurable disease, old age; he had completed his eightieth year. One by one his contemporaries disappeared from the world, some into retirement, some into their graves. In July, 1834, he had heard Earl Grey's farewell to active politics in the upper chamber of the English Parliament. On his return to France a few weeks later he heard of the death of his old friend, Princesse Tyskiewitz, née Poniatowski."8 The Duchesse de Dino writing on the 5th of November, 1834, to the Baron de Barante, said:

^{6 &}quot;Talleyrand the Man," p. 217.

⁷ Talleyrand translated the following passage from Grey's speech and kept it in a pocketbook which he always carried: "At an advanced age a man might be able to discharge the duties of the office I hold under ordinary and easy circumstances, yet, considering the present condition of affairs. I felt that the duties imposed on me were too much for my strength, and that therefore I should be justified in retiring."

^{8 &}quot;Talleyrand the Man," p. 218.

"Again I have had the painful task of announcing a fresh loss to M. De Talleyrand, a sad mission which has been too frequent in the last two years! The worst of it is that at M. De Talleyrand's age it is not only a grief, but a warning. It moves and upsets me more than it does him. He is so calm, but that does not make him resigned to the gradual withering of his legs. He is irritable and impatient. Sometimes it amounts to discouragement, and he sinks into gloomy thoughts."

A week later—on the 13th of November—Talleyrand wrote from Valençay to the Minister for Foreign Affairs, practically insisting on the King accepting his resignation of office as Ambassador at London. The letter contained a distinct reference to a sense of spiritual responsibility, realization of which was to become more and more apparent. The ex-Bishop of Autun wrote:

"My great age, the infirmities which are its natural consequence, the repose which it renders advisable, and the thoughts which it suggests, makes this very natural step not only justifiable, but almost a duty."

Even in his retirement Talleyrand maintained a stately household, gave periodical receptions, at which all whom were worth knowing in Paris were present. He was a constant visitor at the Royal Palace and mingled to a considerable extent in the highest ranks of society, diplomatic, official and literary. Occasionally he was seized by an almost pathetic desire to revisit the scenes of his vouth. "On these days he would order his carriage, take his grandniece, Pauline de Périgord, with him and drive to distant and unfashionable quarters. The old man sought the traces of his past there. In the Faubourg Saint Jacques he would show his companion the house where he lived with his nurse until he was four years old: it was there that a fall from a chest of drawers caused his lameness and cast a shadow over his whole life. Sometimes, in the neighborhood of the Sorbonne, he would stop before the Lycée Saint Louis, formerly the College d'Harcourt, and remember that he had been a pupil there. Sometimes, near Nôtre Dame, before the ruins of the episcopal palace, sacked in the riots, he would relate anecdotes of his uncle, Cardinal de Talleyrand-Périgord. But Saint Sulpice attracted him oftenest. He would alight and, leaning silently on the young girl's arm, stroll haphazard through the gloomy little streets unchanged by time: the Rue Garancière, where he was born; the Rue Feron, upon which his seminary cell overlooked. Friendly phantoms, shades of bygone days, came out to him from the gray facades. One night he went into the church with Pauline and staved there for a long time, pensive and silent. Then he said suddenly: 'I was baptized here,' and was silent once

more."9 "Talleyrand spent as much time as possible at his country house at Valençay, where he loved to play the part of a bountiful and Catholic lord of the manor. His brief amusements were the initiation and inspection of arboricultural and agricultural operations, and nearly all his leisure was spent in the woods and fields or amidst the budding hedge rows. He seemed to rejoice in getting rid of the glamor of the court and the city in the pure sunlight which illumined the hills and vales. When not at Valencay he was generally to be found at the rural home of Madame De Dino, at Rochecotte, in Touraine. We are told that: "When he was made Mayor of Valençay in 1826 he was as delighted as a child. He bought a house to make a town hall; he sent for the nuns of Saint André to keep a girls' school; he founded a free pharmacy, and he organized distributions of bread, wood, linen and money for the poor. In 1836 he rebuilt the church steeple which the vandals of the Terror had pulled down. He gave his mind unweariedly to all these little matters." He attended Mass regularly every Sunday, and the Duchesse de Dino says that "nothing would have induced him to miss it." He constantly read the works of Bossuet, and concerning his study of these his niece has left on record an interesting statement contained in one of her letters to the Abbé Dupanloup. In this she wrote:

"One day in the summer of 1835 my uncle sent for me. I found him reading in his room. 'Come here,' he said to me; 'I want to show you how mysteries should be spoken of; read, read aloud, and read slowly.' I read as follows: 'In the year of the world 4000 Jesus Christ, son of Abraham in time and son of God in eternity, was born of a virgin.' 'Learn that passage by heart,' said M. De Talleyrand, 'and see with what authority and simplicity all the mysteries are concentrated in those few lines. Thus and thus only should holy things be spoken of. They must be imposed, not explained; that is the only way to get them accepted; no other way is of any use, for doubt begins when authority fails; and authority, tradition, the master, are only to be found sufficiently in the Catholic Church.'"

Again, as so often before, it is necessary to quote M. De Lacombe, who says that "Talleyrand had given himself up completely to his duties as lord of the manor; he gave it precedence over all others. Here is an example: In the spring of 1837 he had accompanied the court to Fontainbleau for the marriage of the Duc d'Orleans. He was overwhelmed with attentions; the King lodged him in the superb apartments of Madame de Maintenon; he had a place, among the first, everywhere; and he enjoyed these honors.

^{9 &}quot;Talleyrand the Man," pp. 221, 222.

Suddenly he remembered that the Archbishop of Bot es, Mgr. de Villèle, was coming to Valençay on his rounds to Iminister confirmation. To Valençay! His mind was quickly made up. He would leave Fontainbleau. But the King had invited him to Versailles to the grand feasts for the inauguration of the Museum; he would not go. He got into his traveling carriage with his inseparable Pauline; the postilion took the stages at full speed. They arrived before M. De Villèle; and no one could say that in passing through Valençay my Lord Archbishop had not been the guest of Prince de Talleyrand."10 The young girl named in the foregoing passage may fairly enough be described as Talleyrand's angelguardian. We read on: "Receiving the poor on the feast of Saint Charles and the Archbishop of Bourges on the day of confirmation, always and everywhere we find the same innocent figure by Talleyrand's side. Pauline-Pauline de Périgord, the future Marquise de Castellane. Saint Beuve has said somewhere: 'If there was a good aide to M. De Talleyrand in his extreme old age, it was this piece of pure affection.' Talleyrand loved his grandniece tenderly. Born in 1820, she was more than a child and less than a woman. She inherited her mother's incomparable grace, charm of mind and elevation of thought; but she had something more: a soul of crystal, clear and radiant. Talleyrand called her 'the angel of my house,' and he could not do without her. When they were separated he at Paris or taking the waters, she at the seaside—he wrote to her nearly every day. They are charming letters, light, easy and full of freshness. He gives her news and advice and tells her anecdotes; he is affectionate above all; his old heart seems to grow young again when he speaks to this young girl." The aged statesman evidently possessed that reverence for youth and innocence which all save the irrevocably bad invariably cherish. Pauline was destined to be the chief human factor in securing his salvation. By way of introduction to his description of the facts connected with the actual reconciliation to the Church, M. De Lacombe writes as follows: "The pious death of Prince Talleyrand in the year 1838 was a great event. It caused surprise at the time, when Voltaire reigned supreme.11 There were sly smiles, incredulous airs, criticism and raillery; and some good Christians seemed as disappointed as were the unbelievers. A death like that of Grégoire or Montlosier would have been applauded. A young statesman, who has sometimes been compared to the Prince de Bénèvent, though he

^{10 &}quot;Talleyrand the Man," p. 229.

¹¹ Of course, what the writer means is that the spirit and principles of the cynical philosopher were dominant in the higher classes of the society of the time.

was never is equal, said in the very ante-chamber of the dead: "M. De Ta evrand did not know how to die like a politician." To which the Duchesse de Dion, who overheard his remark, replied: "At least, he died like an honest man." An old survivor of the emigration said: "After duping men, the Bishop of Autun has tried to dupe God." Madame de Girardin welcomed the guests of her salon, where the Vicomte de Launay used to try the effect of the witticisms of his "Lettres Parisiennes," with these words: "Well, is it true? They say that M. De Talleyrand's death was a proof of his savoir vivre." Doudan, who echoed the sentiments of the austere house of Duc Victor de Broglie, wrote to Guizot on the same subject: "It seems to me that the eighteenth century has cut a sorry figure. . . . It is evident that, among its other shortcomings, it does not know how to die." Even the Duchesse de Broglie, whose soul was too serious for jesting or judging, was disconcerted.

"This scene of M. De Talleyrand's is very strange," she wrote to the Baron de Barante. "Please God, He spoke Himself to his heart and whispered what no human voice can utter. I hope and believe it; God sounds all hearts and consciences; He is the God of truth and compassion."

As to the Comtesse de Boigne, grande dame turned gossip, she has devoted a whole chapter of her memoirs to collecting every scrap of tittle-tattle concerning the last scene of the life of the ex-Bishop of Autun. There was only Mgr. de Quélen to rejoice sincerely, with his whole heart, on the day when he hung an exvoto of gratitude in the sanctuary of Notre Dame de la Deliverande; and perhaps Prince Metternich, who on hearing that his former colleague in the Congress of Vienna had bidden farewell to this world, declared solemnly:

"The gratitude of Europe and of all good souls is due to those who contributed to this beautiful death."

The truth, as M. De Lacombe points out, is that "Talleyrand's reconciliation with the Church was not accomplished in an hour, as some have asserted. It was preparing a long time ahead. Talleyrand thought of it for years, and others round him thought of it for many more." Not one of these was more insistent in effort and prayer than his aged uncle, Alexandre Angélique de Talleyrand-Périgord, whom the Revolution found Archbishop-Duke of Rheims and the Restoration made Cardinal Archbishop of Paris. It was a personal matter with this holy prelate. In M. De Lacombe's words: "When his masters at Saint Sulpice doubted the Abbé Périgord's vocation and M. De Beaumont delayed his admission to the priesthood, he had welcomed him to his Diocese of

Rheims, and had allowed him to be ordained in the chapel of his episcopal palace; he had made him his Vicar General and a canon of his cathedral. The memory of this had remained like a raw wound in the upright and law-abiding conscience of M. De Talleyrand-Périgord, who was regarded as a model of all episcopal virtues, and he had sworn to win back to God the soul of the priest he had failed to give Him. As soon as he returned to Paris as Grand Almoner of France he sought his nephew's company and overwhelmed him with kindness. He attracted him to his house and tried by consulting him to interest him in the affairs of the Church. Mgr. de Quélen told Abbé Dupanloup later on that during the difficult negotiations for the Concardat of 1817 Mgr. De Tallevrand-Périgord often sent him to the Rue Saint Florentin in the morning to get the advice of the negotiator of the Concordat of 1801. When the Grand Almoner became Archbishop of Paris their relations grew still closer. It was no longer an exchange of politeness, but of invitations; and the ex-Bishop of Autun was to be seen taking his place at ecclesiastical dinners with Cardinal de Bausset, Cardinal de la Luzerne, M. Feutrier, the future Bishop of Beauvais, M. Borderies, the future Bishop of Versailles, M. Fraysinous, the founder of the celebrated conferences of Saint Sulpice. the Coadjutor, M. de Ouélen, the Vicars General, the superior of the Seminary of Saint Sulpice, M. Duclau, etc. Talleyrand adapted himself: he responded to his uncle's advances and multiplied his visits, and when the Cardinal was ill he spent a short time with him nearly every day. Did matters go any further? Did Mgr. Talleyrand, who felt that death was approaching, venture to broach the redoubtable subject in the course of some intimate conversation? We do not know. He died on the 20th of October, 1821, and his last word was to bequeath to M. De Quélen, his coadjutor and successor, the soul of Prince Talleyrand to be saved."12

The new Archbishop of Paris was not united by any tie of family affection or sense of personal responsibility for his sad career to the Prince. On the contrary, we are told that "M. De Quélen, who had pursued his way, without faltering, through all the storms of the Revolution, felt for Talleyrand, the founder of the Constitutional Church, the married Bishop, something less than liking, a kind of instinctive repulsion. He admitted and regretted it. In the life of Cardinal de Périgord he only visited the ex-Bishop of Autun from a sense of duty—an unfortunate attitude, for it is not by duty, but by love, that a soul is won. Meanwhile, before the sense of duty worked the miracle of arousing love in Mgr. de Quélen, the ice grew thicker for a time between the successor of

^{12 &}quot;Talleyrand the Man," pp. 247, 248, 249.

Mgr. de Talleyrand and his nephew. Who would break it?" It was broken sooner than even the new Archbishop or any one else could have expected. Towards the close of 1823 there was published the "Mémorial de Sainte Hélène." In reviewing its contents some writers in the Paris press made them the basis of fierce attack on many of the chief advisers of Napoleon while First Consul, and especially in connection with the arrest and murder of the Duc d'Enghien. Tremendous charges were made, and in replying to some of these which implicated himself the Duc de Rovigo Savary-in a pamphlet which he issued-sought to cast the main responsibility for a foul crime on Talleyrand. The result was the flowing of a deluge of very black ink. The whole career of the ex-Bishop of Autun was made the theme of vitriolic comment. Faults which Talleyrand himself had, perhaps, half forgotten were mercilessly exposed to the light of day. The King, Louis XVIII., chivalrously stood by the aged statesman who was now his Grand Chamberlain, but the latter felt acutely the opprobrium which was showered upon him. In his agony of mind he uttered to some one a murmur of amazement or regret that no word of sympathy had come to him from the episcopal palace. The complaint was borne to Mgr. de Ouélen, and it touched his heart. Almost immediately he wrote Talleyrand as follows:

"Prince, the apparent wrong with which you reproach me conceals a very real one, which may explain and I hope justify in your eyes the indifference of which you accuse me. . . . It is that I have delayed until to-day to fulfill an obligation towards you which has weighed upon me for some years—a sacred engagement given to that venerable patriarch who was your uncle and my spiritual father; a duty imposed upon me by his kindness, which his death has left entirely to me, and which I have reproached myself every moment for putting off so long, from the instant when I received his last sigh and his last blessing, the duty of urgently imploring you, by every claim it is possible for me to invoke, to remember what religion, the Church, France, your friends and your family expect from you at the end of your career; and of what is required of you for the care and salvation of your soul, so soon to enter its eternal home.

"This, Prince, I confess is what I have delayed too long in saying to you, this is what has made me so reserved. The embarrassment I felt in broaching such a subject to you has made me dread, shun and even fly from your approach and from meeting you, for fear of speaking too soon or of faltering when my speech should be free and assured; or for fear of not finding you disposed to listen to me, and thus indefinitely postponing the hour which

my ardent hopes and fervent prayers never cease to call upon. Until to-day I have never found courage to address you, but knowing that God, who raises the dead, has no need of men in working the greatest miracles, I have dared to ask Him to work that of your conversion, however difficult it may appear, and only in eternity will you know all the violence I have tried to do in heaven and all that which is still being done in my diocese to obtain it. It is sufficient to tell you now that I have never ascended to the altar without bearing you with me, that not a single day has passed that my last prayer has not been for you, and that I have often prayed for you during the night.

"Unfortunate causes, which it is useless to examine now, have drawn you into deplorable consequences and terrible aberrations. I do not mean only in the eyes of the world, which you must leave, and whose judgments, whatever they may be, have often very little influence upon our fate, but before God, whose judgment must decide your eternal happiness or misery. These errors and aberrations have not, I dare to hope, entirely robbed you of your faith. Why should you abandon the hope it leaves to those who come at the last hour? Why should you not employ the years which are left to you in settling your account and effacing with one stroke, as Bossuet says, the enormous debts which the divine mercy remits to those who ask it humbly and sincerely?

"As a Bishop you have caused great affliction to the Church, but you have not hated her. Console her now—that Church who surrounded you with her highest honors, who offered and gave you her highest honors, who offered and gave you her riches and who has not lost the right nor the power of covering you once more with glory in the days of her poverty and abasement. Console her by an example such as she has not seen even in her best days, and which perhaps you alone can show her, an example whose influence may be so strong and happy upon many who, like you, have to make reparation.

"As a Frenchman, what services did you not render to monarchy after our disasters! Even kings owe you their crowns; you have won their gratitude, and you may still force them to admiration by assuring to yourself an immortal crown, which revolutions cannot steal or tarnish, and which I cannot convince myself you have renounced forever."

The Archbishop proceeded to remind Talleyrand of his old teachers at Saint Sulpice, of his pious ancestors and relatives, of his uncle the Cardinal, "leaving to men a memory full of blessings," and of his saintly grandmother; continuing as follows:

"Do you not wish to be reunited to them after having won by

repentance the praise upon earth and the recompense in heaven which they merited by their innocence? What can hold you back, Prince? The illusions of life have passed away; your career is ended; public life can now be nothing but a pastime to you; you have left the political whirlpool and the scene in which others have appeared. Your reputation has nothing to lose by your return; the more open it is, the more it will win you the consideration and esteem of all sensible men, of all those who are good, virtuous and honest. As to the wicked, light and mocking spirits and those who are unfortunate enough to have no more belief in repentance than in virtue . . . what do they matter to you? Fear not those who are powerless to harm the soul; but fear rather Him who can cast both body and soul into hell.

"Few, perhaps, have ever addressed you in such language, Prince. I confess that if my soul is relieved it is also in need of rest. I have done my duty by you as a Bishop and as a friend. . . . Good-bye, Prince, good-bye. You have seen the face of this world change; soon it will pass away for you and with you. Whether I precede or follow you, there is a supreme tribunal before which we will meet again; will it be to part forever? The separations of this world are nothing to those whom faith will reunite; but they will be cruel for those who are to be cut off eternally from the company of the elect." 18

Twelve years were to elapse before this letter produced the full fruit it was intended to bring forth, but it at least secured the creation of friendly relations between Mgr. de Quélen and Talleyrand, the preservation of which both jealously guarded henceforth. Talleyrand kept up a pretty constant correspondence with the Archbishop, and once, when he heard that his Grace proposed to found a house in Paris for advanced theological studies, sent him 10,000 francs, with these words: "To help my Lord Archbishop to raise the ancient Sorbonne, or to supplement it." M. De Lacombe says that all these things kept hope alive in M. de Quélen's heart. He was always on the watch for anything which would bring him into closer contact with Talleyrand. Under pretext of good works, he frequently saw Madame de Dino, feeling that she would be his ally, though he knew she had no personal liking for him. He tried to get some light through her upon the secret workings of the soul he coveted. He sent word to the Prince by her that he was being thought of and prayed for; and he was very disconsolate sometimes because he could not rouse that apostolic zeal in her which consumed himself. The conversion of Talleyrand had become his fixed idea. He never swerved from it in the midst of the

^{13 &}quot;Talleyrand the Man," pp. 250, 251, 252, 253, 254.

tribulations which came upon him with the July Revolution; ¹⁴ the pillage of his episcopal palace, threats against his person, insult and calumny from a certain portion of the press, to say nothing of the bitter grief he felt at the death of Grégoire and the revolt of Lammenais. Talleyrand was now at the London embassy, where he was an eminent figure, and the Duchesse de Dino was with him. The Archbishop never saw them now; he only heard of them from time to time in the newspapers, but he was praying still. In September, 1834, when he was staying with one of his brothers in Normandy, he knelt in the sanctuary of Notre Dame de la Déliverande and prayed: "Oh, my God, I ask for the conversion of M. De Talleyrand. I offer my life to obtain it, and I willingly consent never to hear of it if only I can obtain it!" From that time this was his prayer every night. The prayer was answered as only God can answer.

On the 16th of January, 1834, the Archbishop wrote to Cardinal Lambruschini in Rome asking him to submit the following questions to the Pope: What should be his attitude in case Prince Talleyrand, ex-Bishop of Autun, should have recourse to his ministry? What should be his attitude in case he should die impenitent? The answer from the Vatican was prompt and clear. It was complete not only in the instructions it conveyed to Mgr. de Quélen, but also in its definition of the position of Talleyrand as a member of the Church. The following is a translation of the Cardinal's letter:

"It was not until yesterday that I was able to procure the honor of placing myself at the feet of the Holy Father; and in accordance with his orders I have to signify to you as follows:

- "(1) In the event of the spiritual case you mention, His Holiness grants you the most ample faculties, without restriction, even those which require special mention.
- "(2) You are authorized to delegate these faculties to the two Archbishops of Bourges and Tours, whom you mention, where the person in question may be at the time of his death, or to any other Bishop at need, according to your choice.
- "(3) The only measure emanating from the Holy See during the Pontificate of Pius VII. in favor of the ex-Bishop you mention was to restore him to the lay communion, 'salva obligatione perpetuæ castitatis servandæ,' upon which point no dispensation was ever granted.
 - "(4) Before using the faculties delegated to you on his behalf,

¹⁴ That which deposed Charles X, and installed on the throne Louis Phillipe—the Citizen King of the French—son of the regicide Duke of Orleans, Phillipe Egalite, one of the basest of Voltairean princes.

repentance and sufficient reparation, which he owes to the Church and the faithful, will be required. I say sufficient because the case of the ex-Bishop in question is not to be confounded with that of Grégoire. The latter was a schismatic; the other is not. He was reduced by the act of the Church to the lay communion. This difference should not be lost sight of by your Eminence, to whose charity, discretion and prudence it is left absolutely to decide the exterior method of reparation, even "per verba generalia," which you may think proper to exact.

- "(5) It is not thought fitting at present to send the letter or Brief of which your Eminence speaks with laudable zeal; but when occasion serves, and when you think it prudent, you may inform the person in question of the Holy Father's sorrow and affliction and of the consolation he will derive from his return.
- "(6) In case he does not openly refuse the sacraments at the hour of death, it is thought that ecclesiastical burial cannot be refused.

"Moreover, my Lord, His Holiness desires me to assure you that he will pray with all his heart and will ask prayers for the important work of charity and mercy with which you are concerned and which is most worthy of your pastoral zeal." ¹⁵

When, in December, 1835, the so-called "Princess de Talleyrand" died, Mgr. de Quélen began with redoubled devotion his siege of the Prince's soul. On the 12th of that month he wrote the ex-Bishop of Autun once more in the following words:

"Prince: A lady whom you will easily recognize without its being necessary for one to give her the name to which the civil law entitles her, but which the ecclesiastical law forbids me to employ, has just died in the Rue de Bourbon, No. 87, after expressing a desire to be reconciled to God, asking pardon in the presence of witnesses for the scandal which she might have caused, and receiving the sacraments of the Church. The Lord, ever full of mercy towards those who return to Him in the sincerity of their heart, deigned to make use of my ministry to offer this soul the assistance of His grace before summoning it to appear before His judgment. May this news, Prince, be to you as it is to us, a source of consolation and hope. What joy in heaven and on earth; what a happiness for you, if, warned by this blow which death has struck almost at your door, you should also hasten to profit by the few short instants which remain to you to settle the affairs of your eternity!

"You are aware, dear Prince, of the duty laid upon me by the title of pastor and by the memory of the venerable Cardinal who

^{15 &}quot;Talleyrand the Man," pp. 256, 257.

bequeathed to me, for you especially, all his solicitude and all his tenderness. It is in order to fulfill this duty, without restriction, that I seize this solemn opportunity to implore you to think and labor without delay for the salvation of your soul, which at your age, with its infirmities, is in peril every moment. It is for this reason that I now renew the entreaties which I sent you twelve years ago at this season, in a letter of the 8th of December, 1823, the draft of which has been recovered from the ruins of the episcopal palace and restored to me.

"Therefore, I conjure you, Prince, in the name of Jesus Christ, our brother, pastor, redeemer and our God; in the name of the most holy and immaculate Virgin Mary, His Mother, assured refuge of the greatest sinners, whom you learned to invoke in your youth; in the name of the Sovereign Pontiff, who in granting me the most ample faculties in your behalf, has authorized me to make known to you his grief and affection and the consolation he will derive from your return; in the name of Cardinal de Périgord, to whom it is impossible you should not wish to be reunited; in the name of your family, to which I belong in virtue of the sacred hand which associated me with one of its illustrious heads; in the name of your true friends, of whom I venture to call myself one of the first; shall I add in the name of my trials and tribulations, accepted, endured and offered unceasingly for you; return, return promptly and sincerely to your faith, to your heart and to your conscience. The judge is at your door; you will appear before his tribunal after a long, painful and stormy career. Reconcile yourself with your clamorous conscience whilst there is still time, whilst you are still upon the road, before the end of the day which is drawing to its close; do not expose yourself to falling guilty into the hands of the living God, and to passing from them into those of the executors of His eternal vengeance.

"As ambassador of Jesus Christ to the souls of my diocese, special delegate of the Holy See to yours, furnished with ample powers, charged by my office to bring you words of reconciliation, there is no need, Prince, for me to point out to you the conditions of this peace offered to you by the all-powerful and merciful King of the Universe. You know them as well as any one. You know also that the less reserved you are the more generous He will be.

"The deceased asked me several times to recommend all those in her service to your kindness. . . . I now acquit myself, Prince, of this deathbed commission, which I promised to fulfill. I would do so in person if I thought you had heard and understood the prayer of a heart so devoted to you, and if I could hope that my presence would not be unwelcome to you, because my prayers

had obtained from you a consent, in exchange for which I would willingly sacrifice my life a thousand times.

"Accept, Prince, the tender and respectful homage and affection with which I remain your very humble and obedient servant.

"HYACINTHE, Archbishop of Paris."

These burning words did really touch the heart and soul of Talleyrand. Stirred to emotion, he thus replied:

"Monseigneur: The filial respect which you keep for one who loved you paternally has again shown itself in a manner which touches me very much. I should have liked to express to you in person the high esteem I have for your kindness, but a prolonged indisposition confines me to the house; I have therefore requested Madame de Dino to take you this letter and enter into certain explanations with you, which I hope will prove to you, Monseigneur, the sincere attachment, respect and high esteem with which I beg you to accept my homage.

"PRINCE DE TALLEYRAND."

On the next day, the 13th of December, the ex-Bishop wrote to the Archbishop announcing that he would call at the episcopal palace "in the course of the week," but before he could fulfill this intention he became seriously unwell, and it became clear that the thread of life might snap at almost any moment. Terribly alarmed, Madame de Dino sought Mgr. de Quélen, to know what was to be done. The old heart was nearly pumped out, and, if it suddenly ceased to act, the most deplorable consequences might ensue. The Archbishop recognized the dangers of the situation and summoned a council of eminent theologians and of near friends of the Prince to consider it. At this meeting a draft of the recantation to which Talleyrand must give his adhesion, if he was to receive the sacraments of the Church, was approved. It covered all the public transgressions of his life, in the following words:

"I, the undersigned, Charles Maurice de Talleyrand-Périgord, Duc de Dino, Prince de Talleyrand, Peer of France, ex-Ambassador in England, being attacked by an illness which may at any moment end my days, in presence of the witnesses here named, declare before God that I wish to die in the faith, obedience and communion of our Mother the Holy Catholic Apostolic and Roman Church, in which I had the happiness to be born. I abjure, condemn and retract everything in my words, writings or actions which may be contrary to her dogmas, morals and discipline, especially my participation in the schism of the civil constitution of the clergy and the marriage, illicit and null according to the canon law, which I unfortunately contracted before the sacred altars, by means of

an arbitrary and forced interpretation given to a Brief of the Sovereign Pontiff Pius VII., which only restored me to secular functions and reduced me to the lay communion without dispensing me from the bond of perpetual chastity which I was to observe because of my ordination and the indelible character of my episcopal consecration. I sincerely ask pardon of God for all the faults and scandals of my life, desiring to be reconciled to Him by receiving the sacraments of the Church.

"I also abjure and condemn everything in the writings, letters or memoirs which may appear under my name which may be in the least contrary to the present declaration, which I deliver into the hands of the Archbishop of Paris, authorizing and requesting him to give it such publicity as he may think proper.

"Given in Paris, the _____."

This draft the Archbishop sent to M. Benzelin, the curé of the Madeline, with full instructions as to how it was to be used. In the first place, Mgr. de Quélen pointed out that, even "in articulo mortis," absolution cannot be given to certain persons unless they have first made reparation for the public scandal they have caused. "Therefore, you must in the first place," continued His Grace, "exact repentance and sufficient reparation which the person in question owes to the Church and the faithful. You will exact this reparation in your own person, and not through another." The curé was further instructed to take steps to make known to all the priests of his parish that he alone was charged with "this act of the exterior tribunal." As to the reparation to be exacted, he was told that it was to be found in a packet sealed with the episcopal arms, which he was not to open until he entered the sick room. The Archbishop went on to say that when Talleyrand had signed the document, "if there is no time to lose, and it is not possible to consult me, you may begin to hear his confession and give him absolution 'in articulo mortis,' but if the sick man should be too weak to sign, then a verbal adhesion expressed in the presence of witnesses would suffice, on condition that 'before the administration of the sacraments the witnesses attest the said adhesion in writing." Finally it was pointed out: "You may possibly be summoned to the dying too late, and those about him may assure you that he has verbally adhered to a declaration similar to that which I send you, a duplicate of which has been given to them. In such a case you will request them to commit to writing the assurance which they have given you." The duplicate referred to had been placed in the hands of the Duchesse de Dino. In September, 1836, Talleyrand invited the Archbishop to visit him at Valençay. His Grace accepted the invitation, and the Prince was supremely delighted,

but unfortunately at the last moment he was detained in Paris and compelled to send an apology. A great opportunity was thus lost. Mgr. Dupanloup has preserved an anecdote related to him by the Duchesse de Dino which casts much light on Talleyrand's real attitude towards religion at this time. This is the story as she told it:

"One Sunday after hearing Mass with my uncle in the chapel at Valençay I lingered after every one else to pray for a little while. He waited for me at the door, and when I appeared he said: 'What prayer were you saying just now?' 'I was saying the Pater; it is the prayer I say oftenest.' 'You are right; it is a beautiful prayer. . . . But for myself,' he continued after a moment's hesitation, 'there is another that touches me more and suits me better . . . the Salve Regina.' 'What? A prayer to the Blessed Virgin?' 'Yes,' he replied. 'Do you not pray to the Blessed Virgin?' 'Oh, yes; but not so often.' 'You are wrong! You should say the Salve Regina above all; it will do you good. Come and sit down. I will teach it to you, for I know it by heart. I will teach it to you in Latin and make you understand it.' Then he began the Salve Regina, accentuating it solemnly and explaining each word. Then he repeated it in Latin, interrupting himself at every moment with exclamations: 'Did you ever hear anything so sweet and consoling? "Salve Regina, mater misericordiæ;" those words are delightful.' "Vita, dulcedo et spes nostra, salve;" 'our life, our sweetness and our hope! Learn them by heart and say them often; they will do you good.' So he continued reciting and commenting on each invocation till he reached the last: 'O clemens, ô pia, ô dulcis Virgo Maria!' Then he made me repeat it several times before him, to fix it in my memory. I know it by heart now, and I have never read it in any book; I learned it only from him."

Evidently the Duchesse de Dino owed little to her early instructors in religion, but the days of her youth were those of the Revolution. Day by day Talleyrand was in receipt of letters telling him how good priests and nuns were besieging heaven with prayers for his conversion. He seems to have rather liked these. At any rate, they never offended him, and he generally preserved the missives and the medals and other pious emblems they constantly contained. Gradually, but none the less certainly, he was returning to God. It is impossible, however, in the space at our disposal to quote at length all the evidences on this point collected by M. De Lacombe. We must hasten to Tuesday morning, 27th of March, 1838, when Madame de Dino went to her uncle's room to inquire how he had passed the night. Almost immediately the latter showed her a touching letter which he had received from the Abbé Dupanloup

and which drew tears from her eyes. When she had finished read-

ing, Talleyrand said:

"This is not the time for emotion; all this is a serious matter." He added: "If I were to fall seriously ill, I would send for a priest. Do you think Abbé Dupanloup would be willing to come?"

"I have no doubt of it," replied the Duchesse; "but he could be of no use to you unless you had first returned to your true state, which you have unfortunately left."

"Yes, yes; I know there is something I must do with regard to Rome. I have been thinking of it for quite a long time."

"Since when?" Madame de Dino could not help asking in her surprise.

"Since the last time the Archbishop of Bourges came to Valençay, and also since Abbé Taury was there. I wondered then why the Archbishop did not speak of it, since he was more directly my pastor there; and why that good Sulpician said nothing to me."

The Duchesse seized her uncle's hands, and standing before him with her eves full of tears, she said:

"But why wait for them to speak? Why not take the step so honorable to yourself, so consoling to the Church and all men, spontaneously, freely and generously? You would find Rome well disposed, I know. The Archbishop of Paris is greatly attached to you. Try."

"I do not refuse," replied Talleyrand. "There is something I must do, I know that very well. But do you know what they require of me? Tell me."

Madame de Dino explained that he must offer reparation for the part he had taken in creating and establishing the civil constitution of the clergy, in circulating the so-called Constitutional Bishops and for the scandal of his "marriage," contracted in violation of the laws of the Church. At first the old man was inclined to plead that he had been released from all his sacerdotal obligations by the Pope, but the Duchesse soon disillusioned him on this point. Shortly afterwards he went to his lawyers, opened his political testament, which was in the latter's keeping, and wrote at the head of it: "I declare, in the first place, that I die in the Roman, Catholic and Apostolic religion." Moreover, in this document he had written in 1836, with reference to his union with Madame Grand: "I was free." These words he altered and read: "I thought I was free." It was obvious that Talleyrand realized that the time had come when he must act. M. De Lacombe tells us that his conduct puzzled those around him. "He who generally feared solitude now sought it. They noticed that he sat at his writing table, crossing out, thinking and reading over what he had written; if he heard an indiscreet step approaching he concealed his manuscript and took up a book. What did it mean? One morning as Madame de Dino was starting for the Sacré Cœur at Conflans, where Mgr. de Quélen was to preside at a distribution of prizes to the cholera orphans, the mystery was solved." Talleyrand handed her a quantity of manuscript, a kind of apologia, an avowal that his intentions had been always good whatever his errors, that he had always been attached to the Church and sought to serve it, although "the respect I owe to the memory of those who gave me life does not prohibit me from saying that all my youth was directed towards a profession for which I was not born." The document made no mention of his marriage. It was defensive and exculpating, but it was clearly not what was needful under the circumstances, and the Archbishop of Paris made this clear to Madame de Dino, who conveyed his words to her uncle. Mgr. de Quélen was not content with merely verbal communications. He wrote in the plainest terms, showing the impossibility of the mere explanation offered by Talleyrand being accepted. Regarded at its best, this simply amounted to a plea that the writer had constantly sought to serve the Church by preferring opportunism to either truth or principle. Abbé Dupanloup took the same view of the document as did the Archbishop. Matters, however, were approaching a crisis.

On Monday, May 14, the Duchesse de Dino sent an urgent message to the Abbé Dupanloup. Talleyrand was on his deathbed. The previous Saturday evening, while entertaining guests, he had been seized with illness, shivering, pains and temporary insensibility. A gangrenous anthrax had developed and had to be cut out by his surgeon. At a time when anæsthetics were unknown, the pain was horrible, but Talleyrand never murmured during the operation. By Tuesday all hope of recovery was gone. On that day the Abbé was first received in the room of the sick man, who had, however, rallied in marvelous manner. His visitor pointed out the uselessness of the document he had sent to the Archbishop and presented instead two papers, one a general disavowal, retractation and prayer for forgiveness of his errors, as well as a profession of faith; the other a letter in nearly similar terms to the Pope. Talleyrand read these carefully and asked permission to keep them. The Abbé, of course, consented, and serious conversation regarding spiritual concerns followed. The entire of Wednesday was spent by the holy priest in the sick chamber, Talleyrand repeatedly declaring the pleasure the Abbé's presence gave him and his desire to be reconciled to the Church. At 6 o'clock on Thursday morning, in full possession of his senses, he signed

the two documents in full "Charles Maurice Prince de Talleyrand." When the Abbé came upon the scene, after saying Mass, he heard Talleyrand's confession and gave him absolution. Extreme Unction was administered and the prayers for the dying recited. At half-past 3 on the afternoon of that day, the 17th of May, 1838, the ex-Bishop of Autun passed before the tribunal of God, conscious to the last, praying fervently and wearing round his neck the medal of the Immaculate Conception—the insignia of the ever Blessed Mother of God, for whom he had ever cherished a sentiment of devotion.

WILLIAM F. DENNEHY.

Dublin, Ireland.

ITALIAN "UNIFICATION"—ITS BEGINNING AND ITS RESULTS.

HE terms "unification" and "assimilation" are, phonetically, not quite so euphonious as "that blessed word, 'Mesopotamia,'" but they have acquired a distinct value in recent years as diplomatic arguments. "Annexation" was a harsh-sounding term; "centralization" had a suggestion of Cæsarism in its significance. "Unification," on the contrary, inspires thoughts of celestial order and "assimilation" the merging of the lines that make the rainbow. Ancient Rome did not know such a term as "unification." It honestly set up its sign as engaged in the business of annexation and empire-building. But our nomenclature changes with the requirements of a new ethical standard, which impresses the necessity of assuming a virtue if we have it not and eschewing the brutal language of the Bismarckian school of statesmen.

The real meaning of Italian "unification" was not developed at the beginning of the movement for the liberation of Italy from the Austrian yoke. There was no thought at that time of sweeping away the Temporal Power. This power was racy of the soil—pure Italian. That of the Austrians was foreign and unsympathetic, while that of the Popes throbbed with sympathy for the people. The Austrian rule attracted nobody to Italy. The Papacy, on the other hand, attracted millions every year. When Bonaparte carried the Popes off as prisoners Rome was stabbed to the heart. Its commerce was destroyed, its population was plunged into pauperism. Art was ruined, literature blighted. It is interesting to note that connoisseurs one and all agree in denouncing the hideousness of modern art as exhibited in the architecture and statuary

in Rome of to-day. The era of the rococo was the era of extravagance carried to excess, and, like the indulgence in a debauch, sure to bring its own remedy by reason of the nausea that follows. But the age of the unnatural and the monstrous, as exemplified in the Victor Emmanuel monument, gives no promise of a chastening surfeit; it indicates the paranoia stage in artistic taste, the hopeless darkening of the intellect. It is a very significant fact that the strongest note of grief and indignation over the paralysis of intellect which the festivities over the "unification" called forth came from publications which reflect the mind of the cream of English Protestantism. In "The Saturday Review" a scathing arraignment of the bad taste of the Italian Government, in regard to the tolerance shown the insulters of the Papacy by the House of Savoy, preceded the beginning of the noisy and garish racket. The "Review" said: "Had the conduct of the Italian Government throughout been marked by scrupulous moderation, by strict adherence to solemn engagements, and by respect for the religion of the vast majority of its own subjects, a Vatican completely intransigeant would indeed have found little support outside. Unfortunately, both the action and inaction of successive Italian governments have left no choice to those who, without being Roman Catholics, are compelled by policy or conviction, or a mere sense of decency, to show some respect for the Roman Church. No one can believe that the Italian royal house feels comfortable in the existing condition of things." This is not very reassuring to the cocksure class of publicists who try to reason the reading world into the belief that things are finally settled as far as the Papacy and the Kingdom of Italy are concerned. There have been a good many such "final" settlements in the long centuries since the Papacy was forced by events to assume the heavy burden of the Temporal Power, but the end is not yet.

Roman history teaches at least one lesson that ought never to be forgotten—the fickleness of the people. In every town the statue of the Emperor was everywhere in evidence, and in every town when it became known that the same despot was no more the statues were promptly taken down and roped and then dragged through the mire. The "Review" mercilessly dissects the pretensions of the House of Savoy to have any claim to the allegiance of the Roman aristocracy or the Roman plebs, saying: "The insecurity of its existing tenure probably explains the grotesque insistence upon the virtues of the first monarch of United Italy. There is not a town of any importance throughout the peninsula where that distinguished sovereign is not to be seen in stone or bronze on a prancing steed, in the centre of the principal square.

This exaggerated emphasis of really considerable merits is likely to injure the very object for which it is employed, but it reaches the height of absurdity and touches the extreme limits of bad taste in the monstrosity which rears its ponderous bulk over against the Forum and will remain a monument not to a great king, who in so far as he was great does not need it, but of the senseless extravagance, the ill taste and the mean jealousy of the New Italy. For the ultimate object is not to commemorate the 'Honest King,' but to insult the Pope."

If we desire to trace the genesis of Italian "unification" to its primal source, we shall have to go back to a period when society in Europe was in a state of volcanic convulsion resembling that of parturient nature when planets and suns were projected into space and began that majestic whirling that has ever since continued. The time that witnessed the marriage of Bonaparte and Josephine Beauharnois, widow of a general of the Army of the Rhine, whom the Directory had sent to wed "La Mere Guillotine" because of his failure to do wonders with his sans-culotte soldiers. He had just then laid before the French Directory and Carnot, the famous War Minister, a plan for the invasion of Italy so simple and yet so ingenious in idea, so bold in conception and so entirely original that the "organizer of victory," after carefully going over its details, instantly decided on accepting it and entrusting its execution to the head that had conceived it. Twelve days after his marriage to the beautiful widow (who had barely escaped sharing her husband's fate by the downfall of Robespierre) he was at the head of the Army of Italy on the road toward the Alps, bent on crossing those giant sentinels, but by routes different from those chosen by his great exemplar, the Carthaginian Hannibal. The "Army of Italy," for all its grandiose title, was very little better in composition when it started on its ambitious enterprise than Falstaff's imaginary "ragged regiment," more dangerous to its friends than France's enemies. The troops were half-starved and half-naked, they had no money wherewith to purchase food, and as they advanced on their melancholy way the population disappeared on their approach and left the land almost as bare as though a pest of locusts had descended and ravaged it. When Bonaparte had painfully pushed along to Nice, he issued a proclamation, a model of sub-heroic incitement to deeds of valor:

"Soldiers! You are almost naked, half-starved. The Government owes you much, and can give you nothing. Your patience, your courage, in the midst of these rocks, are admirable; but they reflect no splendor on your arms. I am about to conduct you into the most fertile plains on the earth. Fertile provinces, opulent cities,

will soon be in your power; there you will find rich harvests, honor and glory. Soldiers of Italy, will you fail in courage?"

Can any one not blinded by military hero-worship and the false ethics of military law fail to see in such an address the keynote of the policy which has since been developed by the House of Savoy, whose territory was the first to feel the terrors of its practical application by the naked and hungry crowd whom Bonaparte had whipped and starved into desperate and irresistible soldiers? Piedmont, which was the first to feel the foot of the military mob on its neck, is now the heir-at-law of its corsair policy. By the victory of Bonaparte at Montenotte, Piedmont's soil was laid open to the conqueror, and the King of Piedmont and Sardinia was forced to abandon the alliance with Austria which had long kept him in power and throw himself instead into the arms of the French Republic.

"With the French invasion," writes the eminent English historian, Alison, "commenced a long period of suffering; tyranny under the name of liberty, rapine under the name of generosity, excitement among the poor, spoliation among the rich, clamor in public against the nobility and adulation of them in private; use made of the lovers of freedom by those who despised them, and revolt against tyranny by those who aimed only at being tyrants; general praise of liberty in words and universal extinction of it in action; the stripping of churches, the robbery of hospitals; the leveling of the palaces of the great and the destruction of the cottages of the poor; all that military license has of most terrible, all that despotic authority has of most oppressive. Then did her people feel that neither riches of soil nor glories of recollection, neither a southern sun nor the perfection of art can save a nation from destruction if it has lost the vigor to inherit or the courage to defend them."

It is not necessary to dwell upon the direful disasters which overtook unhappy Italy once her soil was begun to be overrun by the triumphant hordes of the new democracy. The long reign of misery and disgrace did not end until the cannon of Waterloo had pronounced sentence of deposition against the Corsican autocrat, and he had in the meanwhile captured Rome and sent two Popes as prisoners of his from its sheltering walls. He had driven the iron of persecution deep into the souls of the downtrodden people; but if he did he had also taught them the way in which to combat the tyranny that is irresistible by day by utilizing the advantages of the night. It was under the oppression of the French in that bitter era that the terrible antidote of the midnight secret society was invented.

It is difficult to fix the time or the occasion when the idea of the secret society for the substitution of personal vengeance for the public vengeance of the law, exacted for the public good and the purgation of the general weal, began to be known as an organized system, in various countries. It is a fact pretty well agreed upon that in the larger islands of the Mediterranean Sea the practice of the vendetta had been so long existent as to be recognized as a sort of religious cult, a family or tribal obligation devolving on the next mate of the family of a murdered man. This practice or custom necessarily drew different members of the families or clans into association in what was known as a blood bond. From the islands it spread in course of time to the mainland; and from the mountaineers of Italy and Albania and Montenegro to the towns and cities, until the secret societies covered the entire State and the Vehm-Gericht, or midnight secret tribunal, in the Middle Ages, had almost entirely supplanted the tribunals of the civil lawjust as we find to be the case in Italy to-day in regard to the Mafia, the Camorra and other associations of criminal men. The Carbonari was, and may still be, for aught the outside world knows, the most formidable of these dreadful secret combinations. It is international in its character, though for some years its active work seems to have been confined to the Italian Peninsula; but after its establishment in Italy the revolutionary system which its members sedulously inculcated began soon to spread to Spain and Portugal and France, and we behold it more active in the latter countries than even in Italy to-day.

The first Carbonari were bands of men who got their living by making charcoal. In Italy and France this product is largely used for industrial and domestic purposes, and its manufacture gives employment to many people in the rural and hilly districts in the south of Europe. Italy numbered a hundred thousand Carbonari in 1820, says the biographer of Pope Leo XIII., Monsignor Bernard O'Reilly. But all of these, he says, were not hostile to the Church or to religion in general. At the beginning the movements which tended toward a banding of the whole membership in one mighty organization had many contributory elementsdreamers of many types, the Illumanati, the Voltaireans, the Jacobins, the Jansenists. These visionary individuals had many followers-for the army of the disinterested is always self-recruiting and automatic in the processes of leadership and filling up of gaps as the prisons close on the more dangerous and vociferous members. Perhaps one of the most reliable authorities on the origin and composition of the Carbonari, the aims and cult of the organization, is Neibuhr. In a letter to Madame Hensler, one of his closest friends, he wrote from Rome, under date of October, 1820, as follows:

"They were originally nothing more than a development of Freemasonry, and it might perhaps be said that all the Freemasons in Italy are Carbonari, or Guelphs, or Adolphs, etc., though the converse would not hold good; for the derived associations have attained a much wider extent than the parent society. When the French invaded Italy in 1796, and occupied Rome in 1798, Naples in 1799, the revolution had been prepared in the lodges of the Freemasons, and, with a few exceptions, all the Freemasons declared for it, The generation who were then growing up, without affection for anything, striving only after commotion, still harbored under the French rule a longing for ferment and change, while the elder generation, especially those whom we term cultivated people, attached themselves with joy to the government of Bonaparte, whose legislation afforded them the realization of all that according to their system they demanded as that without which there can be no salvation; viz.; new codes of law, equal inheritance, the removal of all corporations, convents, etc., some of which measures were wholesome, some injudicious and some vitally pernicious. When the name Carbonari came into use I do not know; but the class already existed in the provinces under Murat. They did not, however, attain much importance till afterwards, when they were joined by the party of Murat, which certainly was a curious amalgamation. They have the greatest variety of objects, from the unity of all Italy under a Bonapartean to her dissolution into a federative republic. Of course, by far the majority of them simply follow their leaders blindfold, and large numbers have no object, that is, they only desire anarchy. The tendency to a federative republic prevails, however, to the greatest extent among those who have the most practical truth in their views, as it does in Spain and Portugal, which the revolutionists would divide into seven republics. To this the armies are opposed, except in so far as their chiefs may influence them on the condition of becoming presidents themselves. The conspiracy lately discovered at Naples to murder the Ministers shows what we have to expect when the Parliament shall be assembled. There are numbers of the clergy among the Carbonari, especially monks, who lost their taste for a conventual life during the secularization; they have many members, too, among the inferior nobility. A part of the higher nobles were with them also at first, attracted by the promise of an aristocratic Constitution."

When Mazzini and Garibaldi succeeded in their ambitious efforts to gain control of this wild elephant, as the hitherto aimless but terribly formidable organization may figuratively be styled, the real objective was soon made clear enough. It was the destruction of the Papacy, both as a spiritual and as a temporal institution.

When Cardinal Pecci (afterwards Pope Leo XIII.) was in Belgium as Papal Nuncio he wrote a remarkable pastoral on "The Temporal Dominion of the Popes," in the course of which he quoted the official declaration of the Central Lodge of the Carbonari in Italy, which stated that: "Our final purpose is that of Voltaire and the French Revolution—the total annihilation of Catholicism and the Christian idea itself."

If "history repeats itself" in the psychical world as the physical, the period of which we are now treating was par excellence the age of the idealists and the dreamers. It was, not unnaturally, also the age of charlatans. In this respect it resembled this our own age, when fake religions like Dowieism and Eddyism and a hundred other minor "isms" can pass for cults worthy of serious people's attention. In the days of '48, when revolution was endemic, it might be said, over a great part of Europe, odic force, animal magnetism and spiritualism were the great fashionable scientific fads of the time. These hedonisms did not form part of the revolutionary programme, as a general rule, but they assisted it indirectly by diverting the thoughts of people into wild, uncertain and bewildering channels and loosening the anchors of faith from their old and settled moorings, leaving the ship of reason to be drawn by the irresistible currents of defection and agnosticism; so that many men who would be otherwise sane enough became so blinded by false reasoning as to fail to perceive the danger of lending countenance to separate attacks on settled government, in different places, for those who led such attacks were careful at first to keep hidden the fact that they were only part of the grand design that underlay the whole movement. In France and Italy the spiritualistic or mesmeristic gatherings were more or less in sympathy with the revolutionary impulse of the time, while in Great Britain and the United States the seances were attended rather by those who were attracted by curiosity or the prospect of reaping some profit from the weaknesses of the gullible by pandering to their love of the mysterious and the awesome. Amongst the notable pastorals issued by Cardinal Pecci was one that sounded a very impressive note of warning on the dangers of the craze over "The Abuses of Magnetism." It was published in 1857 and was so ingeniously phrased as to afford no pretext for describing it as a political manifesto, nor yet as an attack upon the truths of science or the domain of scientific research, to both of which the enemies of the Church are constantly misrepresenting her attitude as that of an enemy. Cardinal Pecci had been well prepared to discharge this delicate duty effectively. His early studies in theology had been carried out in the famous University

of the Sapienza. In this institution the professor of theology was Father Perrone and the prefect of studies a master no less exalted, Father Madera. These two teachers had set up an academy for the particular purpose of cultivating the art of defending the truths of the Revealed Word and the whole body of theological science as it was affected by the discoveries of physical science. During young Pecci's sojourn in the schools of Rome two solemn disputations were held in the hall of the Sapienza University. Four of the cleverest of the students prepared an attack on the doctrines of the Church, based on the most difficult of the problems presented by the apparent irreconcilability of the supernatural dogmas with the physical facts of nature and the laws of the visible universe, as relied on by rationalism and materialism.

Another agency of leagued disorder with which Cardinal Pecci had to deal then and later on was the new Socialism of Lassalle and Karl Marx. It has been a strident and raucous force since that time, and is so more than ever, perhaps, now and here in the United States. This new Socialism Leo XIII. demonstrated later on in his magnificent Encyclical beginning with "Quod Apostolici Muneris" (1878), on the genesis and character of Socialism, was nothing more or less than the natural fruit of the diffusion of the sixteenth century doctrines on the subject of human society in its relations to the Divine law and the derivation of human authority. This derivation of Socialism threw German rulers and theorists into as great a tempest of fury as Pope Pius X.'s recent reference to the Lutheran celebrations in the Empire. But dates have, like dead languages, their priceless uses. They may pass, but they leave an immutable fact in every case as a witness that cannot be either bribed or intimidated on a question of truth which may be vital to the existence of human society. It was in the sixteenth century that the Novum Organum, the new Humanism, bobbed up like a horrible buffoon at a wedding feast, to turn the festivity into a "dance of Death."

So bold an exposure of the aims and guiles of the Socialists as was given first by Pope Pius IX. and later by his immediate predecessor was little relished by the statesmen who in Italy, in France and in Germany found it good policy to make friends with all theorists and enemies of none—even with political assassination propagandists. Though the time was to come when the assassin's poniard was to bring woe into the household of the ambitious Savoyards, no royal fulmination was ever heard against the dreadful gospel incessantly being taught by the man whom the thirsting disciples blasphemously styled "the Master," in mockery of the attitude of the disciples of Him who taught the gospel

of patience, peace and love of enemies. With a degree of hypocrisy that is profoundly sickening, the King of Sardinia kept on assuring the Pope, as his troops kept pushing on the work of conquest in the Papal States by successive usurpations, that he was a fervent Catholic and a loval adherent of His Holiness. While these filial assurances were being respectfully tendered the King's Ministers, Cavour, Minghetti, and others were in constant communication with the leaders of the men whose ideas of liberty were written with the "silver point" of the dagger or proclaimed to the world with the voice of the bomb and the crash of the infernal machine. The cynicism of the conspirators, as they rushed around the world calling for aid and sympathy in their warfare against order and constituted authority was truly amazing. They were fighting for constitutional government, they did not hesitate to proclaim aloud. The apostate priest, Alessandro Gavazzi, who followed Archbishop Bedini from one American city to another with the object of procuring his assassination, had the coolness to address to the Government of Lord Palmerston a letter containing this innocent avowal:

"We fight for the sole purpose of uniting all Italy under the Constitutional sceptre of Victor Emmanuel. Let Englishmen repudiate the idea that there is anything republican in the present movement, since the most ardent advocates of republicanism have sacrificed their views to the great cause of our independence, unity and constitutional liberties. Be sure that if there is no intervention in our fighting we shall survive to crown our dear Victor Emmanuel King of Italy."

Thus one wing of the army of the secret oath. Another, acting under the direct orders of Mazzini and Garibaldi, used different watchwords. They were soldiers of the Republican Revolution and hated the pretensions of monarchy. They were led by the two men who embodied the grand principle of "The Thought and the Action." They were taught by expert surgeons, practicing upon corpses of men gotten from the hospitals, the fine art of murder anatomy. Each eager student was initiated into the science of the arterial system, so that there need be no unnecessary waste of effort on the part of the men of action when the men of thought had directed that a blow be struck for Republican liberty against "Constitutional sceptres!"

And all this deception and double dealing was embarked in for the purpose of gratifying the ambition of the petty monarch who has come down to history as the "Honest King!"

This question of Italian "unification" under one civil ruler had often been mooted in the course of the centuries, from the time

of Cola da Rienzo down to those of Napoleon Bonaparte. The latter had endeavored to settle it after the Alexandrine method by seizing the Patrimony of Peter and making the Pope a peripatetic prisoner as he moved, like Tamerlane, along his skull-paved highways of conquest. When his invertebrate nephew came to be Emperor he, in obedience to the oath he had taken as a member of the Italian Carbonari, proposed that Italy be united under a civil monarchy, but both M. Guizot and M. Thiers resisted the proposal with great strenuousness. In a former article we gave a telling passage from M. Guizot's writings on the subject; now we shall quote M. Thiers. In a memorable speech delivered by that eminent statesman and patriot, before the French Corps Legislatif, upon the subject of German and Italian unification (March, 1867), he said, inter alia: "When distinguished Italians have spoken to me of unity I have said to them: 'No, no; never! For my part, I will never consent to it;' and if at the time when that question came up I had the honor to hold in my hand the affairs of France I would not have consented to it. I will say to you, even, that upon that question (pardon me for being personal) the friendship, very ardent and sincere, which existed between Monsieur Cayour and me has been interrupted." Thus said the foremost statesman of that epoch, the most disinterested and self-sacrificing, as he proved himself to be on more than one occasion—the man who saved France from greater dismemberment than she suffered when she lay bleeding and prostrate, like a gladiator in the Colosseum, at the foot of Prussia-a victim of the guilty ambition and egotism of Louis Napoleon, the former Carbonari member and special constable of England. M. Thiers was a Protestant Frenchman, as was M. Guizot, the former Prime Minister of Louis Philippe. Thiers was a genuine Republican; Guizot was a genuine Monarchist: vet both were agreed on the cardinal principle of European policy at that particular time, viz., that the Pope and the Papacy were absolutely necessary not only to the balance of power in Europe, but to the peace of the world. By the terms of the Treaty of Villafranca, in 1859, after the battles of Magenta and Solferino had been fought, all the straggling monarchies and principalities of the Italian Peninsula were united, save the Papal States, under Victor Emmanuel, with the questionable title of King of Italy. Eleven years later, when the Franco-German War had been fought and the Emperor of the French had paid the penalty of his ambition, the question of the Papal States immediately came upon the political tapis. In Dr. J. S. C. Abbott's book on "Italy" (Story of the Nations series) the larger aspects of the problem then presented are thus impartially arranged and summarized:

"The question respecting the Papal States now became exceedingly embarrassing and difficult of solution. There was no monarch in Europe who was better entitled to his realms than the Pope. There was no sovereign more solemnly hallowed by time and by the recognition for centuries of all the courts in Europe than the Papal sovereignty. Neither Victoria nor Alexander nor Francis Joseph could present a more indubitable claim to the crown which each of them wore. The question arose, 'What right have Sardinia and Lombardy and Naples and Tuscany and other minor States to unite and by the power of their combined armies seize upon the possessions of the Pope and annex them to their realms? The Pope had neither made nor menaced any aggression against them. He had done nothing whatever to warrant the hostile invasion of his territory.'

"And again, the enormous wealth expended in rearing the magnificent Cathedral of St. Peter, innumerable other churches, the gorgeous pile of the Vatican and in filling them with the treasures of art, belonged, not to the city of Rome, but to the universal Catholic Church, of which the Pope was the recognized head. It would be difficult to count the money value of these treasures of architecture and of art. The sum amounted to millions upon millions, obtained by gifts from devout Catholics through many centuries and from all the Catholic world. 'What right,' it was asked, 'have surrounding kingdoms and duchies to unite and by the might of their resistless armies to grasp these treasures?' The Pope was the recognized spiritual head of two hundred millions of subjects in Europe. This was their property, which they had intrusted to the keeping of the temporal and spiritual Sovereign of the States in the midst of which this property was deposited.

"Again, it was asserted that it was essential to the welfare of Europe that the Pope should enjoy so much of temporal sovereignty as should render him independent. The moral power, swayed by the Pope, was immense almost beyond comprehension. It was not consistent with the safety of Europe that the King of Italy, or the King of Austria, or any other Sovereign, should be permitted to annex the Papal States to his dominions, and thus compel the Holy Father to become his subject."

Dr. Abbott's work propounds the theory that Victor Emmanuel had no alternative, when the French were withdrawn from Rome, but to seize the city and repress disorder. The defense is plausible, but it can hardly hold water. The natural reply to it is that the forces of disorder had been sent into Rome and the Papal States furtively by the agents of the Italian Government for the very purpose of creating disorders, and so afford the pretext which the

Government needed. But the most anti-Papal historians are forced to admit the utterly untenable and indefensible character of the pretext. It was the Governmental press in Florence that first raised the cry, "On to Rome!" and shouted triumphantly that the hour of doom for the Temporal Power had struck and that the power must be extinguished. The Italian Government had raised a demon, and it was his slave. There was as much danger for Victor Emmanuel's throne as for the Pope's, for Mazzini and Garibaldi hated monarchy in any shape. It was the firm determination of these infidel plotters to reëstablish in Rome the Republic, ushered in with the murder of the eminent and enlightened statesman, Count Rossi, in 1848. The journal "Italia" of September 15, 1870, declared openly that "the Italian democracy had seen in the question of the capital too good a pretext to perpetuate agitation to permit it to escape them." Caught thus "between the devil and the deep sea," the wretched intriguing Monarchy determined to forestall the strategy of its whilom tools and seize the stake for which they had been playing while ostensibly playing it for the House of Savoy. The Pope was helpless and friendless. He could do no more than protest and make a show of resistance against an invader, it was plainly seen; and so the desperate plunge was determined on by the Janus-faced King and his pliant Ministerial tools. On the 7th of September the Italian Minister of Foreign Affairs in Florence issued a circular to the Cabinets of Europe, in which he stated that the interests of the Italian Monarchy demanded immediate action in taking possession of the States of the Church. "The security of Italy," he wrote, "renders it essential that an end should be put to a state of things which maintains in the heart of the peninsula a theocratical government in open hostility to Italy, and which, by its own confession, can only subsist by means of foreign intervention, and whose territory offers a base of operations to all the elements of disorder."

This pretext was as bold a falsehood as any lying Talleyrand ever propounded. Napoleon's commissaries whom he sent to the Papal States to administer them during the captivity of the two Popes, Pius VI. and VII., found them wonderfully well administered, prosperous and contented. We have already shown, from the careful reports drawn up by the Count de Tournon, how excellent was the administration of the Ecclesiastical States, how ample the provisions for the public weal, in education, in hospital service,

¹ Elementary instruction is afforded to the people of the Roman States with a liberality such as few countries can boast of. In the city of Rome alone eight schools kept by the religious congregations "Scholarum Piarum" and "Samaschi," fifty-two schools, called "regionare," or district, for boys, and an equal number for girls, are opened to the poor, some

in provision for the needs of the poor, in the supervision of the department of finance,² how crimeless was the rural population (before the Sardinian agents were sent among them to raise discontent and preach disloyalty).

Then a bolder step was determined on. The court at Florence sent a letter to the Pope by Count Ponza di San Martino, of Sardinia. This document, which was very deferentially worded, announced to the Holy Father the determination of the Italian Government to take possession of the States of the Church and to constitute Rome the capital of United Italy. The Pope was assured of the profound respect with which the Italian Government would still regard his spiritual power. But he was informed that it was one of the necessities of the times that he would be deprived of his Temporal Power; and he was entreated to submit to the inevitable with as good a grace as possible.

The reply of the Pope, which was a very laconic and emphatic refusal, was given in a formal audience granted the Ambassador on the 10th of September, 1870. The very next day—Sunday, September 11—the troops of Victor Emmanuel crossed the frontier and entered the States of the Church. The Pope, conscious that any resistance would be unavailing, commanded that there should be only such show of force at the gates of Rome as to prove to the world that his realms were wrested from him by military violence.

So fell—for the present—the oldest sovereignty in the Christian world. It did not fall by the will of the people of that sovereignty, but by the act of a brigand power external to the Papal States, aided by the daggers of an assassin horde and the buccaneering tactics of a foreign swashbuckler and mercenary adventurer. Campbell's threnody on the downfall of Poland is touchingly eloquent over the subject. The crimelessness of Sarmatia is blazoned so as to move the reader to tears, like the woes of Hecuba. What crime was there to be laid at the doors of the Papacy as justification for tearing the crown from the Pope and seizing his territory with robber hand? gratis, and the rest for a fee of about two francs per month. country towns and villages there are masters, paid by the municipal fund, who teach reading, writing and arithmetic, so that not a single child need remain deprived of the first elements of education. But here, as elsewhere, either poor parents neglect to send their children to school, or the latter, being destitute of the means and leisure, soon forget the little they had learned.—De Tournon, Vol. II., page 81.

² On examining the Papal finances we were struck by the fact of the equal distribution of the public taxation, of which the clergy and the nobility have always borne their share in proportion to their properties, like the commonest villager; exemptions and privileges which in other countries have engendered so much hostility against these classes have been for ages unknown in Papal Rome,—De Tournon, Vol. II., page 61.

Many great tragedies have darkened the course of human justice in the dealing of nation with nation, but the remotest annals fail to furnish any analogy to the drama of the outrage on the ancient Kingdom of the Temporal Power. Its sacrilege was not only directed against a spiritual supremacy that was accepted as a matter of Divine ordinance, but against the moral law in the civil realm whose integrity is recognized as essential to the institutions of civilization and the stability of responsible governments. No breach of faith so monstrous was ever before beheld. Even Mahometans had always respected the rights of the Holy See and the honor and dignity of its Temporal Power. It remained for degarroter against the most venerable figure in the whole civilized Freemasons and assassins to put such an affront upon the conscience of Christendom as to use the means of the highway robber and the garotter against the most venerable figure in the whole civilized world, simply because, in the mysterious ways of Providence, a chance of war put it in their power so to do. It is well that such should be the only title of the House of Savoy to the possession of the Quirinal and the mastery of Rome. From men who have been suckled by wolves the mildness and innocence of lambs cannot be expected. Those who have only such title as force gives them over imprescriptible and historic right cannot expect any better treatment than they themselves applied when the hour comes as it must eventually come, unless the whole experience of the world's vicissitudes is to be nullified in this case—for the final John J. O'Shea. risorgemento. Philadelphia.

CRITICISMS IN KANT.

KANT AND THE EXISTENCE OF GOD.

DMIRABLY adapted as are the pages of a quarterly magazine for the discussion of grave problems, such a mode of discussion is, unfortunately, not without its attendant drawbacks. Owing to the variety of subjects discussed in the popular review, the number of pages assignable to any particular one is necessarily limited. It thus not infrequently happens that, unless it is to outrun all the conventional limitations of magazine publication, a serious and important dissertation is compelled to halt in the middle of its prearranged arguments—just as in the serial story the chapter breaks off at the point of most intense interest. In the story, however, the interruption serves but to whet the appetite for further details; while in the philosophical discussion the thread of the argument is broken in twain and the subsequent connection loses much of its force and power. Divisions of this kind, while wholly unavoidable, become a positive detriment where the arguments are cumulative in their force. Cardinal Newman was of opinion that all the arguments for the divine mission of the Church are cumulative in their evidence, although each possesses its own individual power for conviction. The same may be said of the arguments for the existence of God. It is true that in these criticisms of Kant's "Critique of Pure Reason" we are not engaged in any way of proving the existence of the Supreme Being; but our task, while wholly distinct from, is cousin-german to it. It is the disproof of the fallacious arguments by which Kant imagines that he has succeeded in discrediting the proofs hitherto accepted by the world for the existence of the author and creator of the universe. And here, too, while each argument stands on its own impregnable foundation, the separation of them deprives them of the cumulative force which must necessarily result from presenting them together arrayed as one organic whole.

It thus happens that while our criticisms of Kant's position laid down in our last article are conclusive and unanswerable, their efficacy would have been doubly enhanced had we been able to add to them the crowning argument which should have formed, as it were, the capstone of the whole. Divorced from its mates, this argument, it is true, is irrefragable, but when presented with the others, it seems to us it would be difficult for the most resolute and thoroughgoing Kantian to parry it or make any successful defense against their united force. For this reason we may be

permitted to recapitulate as briefly as possible the substance of the arguments in our last article.

The arguments by which Kant attempts to justify his rejection of the accepted proofs for the existence of God are twofold in character. First, he denies objective validity to the argument from causality as applied to the existence of God; that is, he denies objective reality to the necessary Being which is forced upon us by the laws of reason as the inevitable conclusion from the existence of the contingent to the existence of its cause. Secondly, he maintains that, since we can never meet with the Supreme Being in experience, there can be submitted no conclusive argument for the existence of God.

These two objections are practically one, the first deriving whatever efficacy or force it possesses from the second. Kant imagined that the human mind was related to the knowledge of God as to no other form of knowledge. Consequently, he made the attempt to isolate this knowledge, to place it in a class by itself, and at it, thus singled out and alone, to point the finger of scorn. There could hardly be anything more shallow than Kant's ineffectual attempt on this point, and there is certainly nothing which so betrays the utter untrustworthiness of Kant as a leader of thought in the investigation of serious problems. For the existence of God is far from being the only truth which cannot be empirically demonstrated. Our knowledge upon this point does not, by any means, stand alone. If we are to reject everything as false which we cannot experimentally prove, or, to use Kant's phrase, which we can never meet with in experience, we must begin at the very beginning and reject all the primary principles on which all our empirical knowledge rests. If Kant's contention be sound upon this point, then does he overturn the very foundations themselves on which all experience is based, and all our empirical knowledge becomes nothing but mere illusion. The validity of all our knowledge in experience rests wholly and entirely on the truth of the principles of causality and the truth of the principle of contradiction. Kant himself freely admits them. Take away the truth of these and all experience means nothing but illusion. Before we can take one single step in the realm of empirical knowledge the truth of these principles must be accepted; nevertheless, it will be difficult for Kant to show experimentally that these principles are possessed of objective validity. They are prior to all experience. Their apodictic certainty cannot be empirically demonstrated; nevertheless, it is through them, and through them alone, that we can give any meaning at all to experience. Nothing is easier than to deceive ourselves upon this point, however, as Kant has done. It will not do to say, as

Kant does, that the application of these principles in experience proves their truth. To make such an assertion with Kant would be to fall into the most vicious kind of all vicious circles. To take these principles for truths and then interpret experience by them, and then to turn about and maintain that since they successfully interpret experience for us their truth is thereby proved, would be a petitio principii for which the back form pupil would deserve a flogging. Unless they are true prior to their application in experience, all their interpretation of experience for us may be nothing but delusion. What is necessary is the acceptance of these principles prior to and before all experience—the admission that these principles are true, independent of all experience, and they cannot mislead us. Unless this is true, we can have no guarantee whatever that all our empirical knowledge is not mere illusion, and that in following these principles we are but building on the shifting sands of the desert. This is so true that it is incontrovertible. Here, then, are whole realms of knowledge where we can have no empirical proof of the objective validity of the truths which we accept. Consequently, when Kant rejects the proofs for the existence of God, because the conclusion to which reason leads us on this point cannot be shown to possess objective validity, he is but undermining the very foundation on which all our empirical knowledge rests.

The blow is aimed at the existence of God; but it strikes down with it all other knowledge as well. Kant's astuteness in attempting to isolate the existence of God and make it the scapegoat of knowledge proves to be a boomerang which is more destructive to all our empirical knowledge than to the object of his attack, and which would reduce it all to mere illusion. That Kant's reasoning on this point has imposed upon the world is all the more surprising, because in order to arrive at his strange conclusion he had been compelled to violently contradict himself; and there was only necessary for his full refutation an appeal from Philip drunk to Philip sober. It is the philosophical value of a logical necessity that Kant has been obliged to call in question when he draws his insane conclusion which outrages all the laws of reason. This logical necessity he had the temerity not only to question, but to try to discredit in order to maintain his foolish point. All that is necessary to show that on this point Kant was ready to blow hot and cold with the same breath when it served his point was to place in deadly parallel his own contradictory views upon the subject as we do here. The objective validity of a logical necessity Kant admits when he will, and this, too, he rejects when he listeth.

Look first on this:

Nevertheless, this pure, logical necessity has exerted so powerful an illusion that after having formed of a thing a concept a priori so constituted that it seemed to include existence in its sphere, people thought they could conclude with certainty that, because existence belongs necessarily to the object of that concept, provided always that I accept the thing as given (existing), its existence also must necessarily be accepted (according to the rule of identity), and the Being therefore must itself be absolutely necessary.

And then on this:

Thus the concept of cause, which asserts under a presupposed condition, the necessity of an effect, would become false if it rested only on some subjective necessity implanted in us of connecting certain empirical representations according to the rule of causal relation. I should not be able to say that the effect is connected with the cause in the object (that is, by necessity), but I am so constituted that I cannot think these representations as connected in any other way. This is exactly what the skeptic most desires, for in that case all our knowledge, resting on the supposed objective validity of our judgments, is nothing but mere illusion. (Italics ours.)

The importance or value of Kant's contention on the subject of the proofs for the existence of God may, we think, be safely left to the silly contradiction between these two statements. Nevertheless, it is difficult to restrain the natural impulse to characterize in its proper terms Kant's barefaced jugglery in his unscrupulous misrepresentation of this all-important problem. The contradictory statements show that it was not from ignorance that Kant resorted to misrepresentation and palpable fallacy.

In his second objection to the proofs for the existence of God he tells us that since we can never meet with the Supreme Being in experience we can never be convinced of the existence of such a Being. That any one with the slightest pretensions to the name of philosopher should advance this as a reasonable argument seems at first hardly credible; but that such a shallow statement should be accepted as the Ultima Thule of all philosophical inquiry—as has been done in the modern philosophical world—is not calculated to inspire respect for our modern intellectuality. And, save the mark! these are the scholars that sneer at Aristotle and Aquinas, at Plato and Augustine! Kant himself, in his sane moments, was perfectly capable of understanding—and did understand perfectly—the utter futility of his own audacious contentions. In his insane

ambition, however, "to leave a treasure to posterity," he did not scruple for a moment to argue against his own sane convictions. As we have already said, he believed he was perfectly safe in here advancing absurd arguments and giving utterance to palpable nonsense and meaningless contradictions, relying on the abstruseness of the subject to shield him from detection. But, as we have just said, if we are to reject all knowledge that is not empirical, what becomes of our empirical knowledge, since it rests wholly on our a priori knowledge, which is the very reverse of empirical? Is the knowledge of God from reason the only knowledge that is not empirical? What of the empirical nature of the principles on which all experience depends and without which experience can have no meaning of any kind? What of the truth of the principles of contradiction and causality? What of the nature of substance? Can Kant make an affidavit that in any body-whether corporeal or incorporeal—a substance really exists? Not at all. We accept the truth because we must; but of this substance we can have no such thing as sense-experience. This substance can never be met with in experience. What, then, of its objective reality? If causality and contradiction and substance, besides various other notions to which Kant as a philosopher dare not deny existence, and consequently objective reality, cannot be shown empirically to possess objective validity, where is the philosophical consistency in accepting these fully and rejecting wholly the existence of God, because it cannot be empirically demonstrated? That there is then a knowledge a priori which we must accept if we are to interpret experience at all, and that this knowledge a priori can never be met with in experience is a fact which will not admit of contradiction. No one understood this better than Kant, for again and again he reverts to the subject, and even asks bluntly: "For whence should experience take its certainty if all the rules which it follows were again and again empirical?" And again he asks himself the question, "whether there exists a knowledge independent of experience, and even of all impressions of the senses?" To this he has no hesitation in answering that there exists such a knowledge independent of experience and all sense impressions. "That there really exists in our knowledge such necessary, and in the strictest sense, universal and therefore pure judgments a priori, it is easy to show." And he instances in proof the principles of mathematics in science; and in philosophy-or the region of the understanding—the principle of causality. But how, in the face of all this, Kant could for a moment think of maintaining that he was justified in rejecting the existence of God or the proofs therefor, because the existence of God can never come within the range of our

experience, is, as Lord Dundreary would put it, one of those things which no fellow can find out. As a standing conundrum it is equaled only by its concomitant problem: Why Kant should have so many duped followers upon this point? Possibly, however, the latter is not a conundrum at all, and that the answer to it may be: Because the said followers are incapable of forming an opinion one way or the other or of comprehending the absurdity of their position. The calm, easy assurance with which ignorance or incapacity for philosophical principles, entrenched on its lordly heights, where it is complacently seated on its lofty throne, emancipated from the thraldom of knowledge and the trammels of logical conclusions, looks down with a mingling of infinite pity and everlasting scorn upon those who are unreasonable enough to decline such emancipation, is something to command, if not our admiration, at least our wonderment and surprise. Kant rejects the argument from causality for the existence of God because the objective validity of this conclusion can never be met with in experience. Yet he asks at the same time: "Whence should experience take its certainty if all the rules which it follows were again and again empirical?" Aye! there's the rub. Whence does experience take its certainty? It cannot be from experience. Experience can never be its own voucher. It can never furnish its own guarantee. There must be some other warranty for the truth of experience; and as Kant himself is constrained to admit, this warranty is furnished only by the truth of a priori principles. So that in the long run at the bottom of all our empirical knowledge or knowledge in experience there lies-and must lie-the truth of principles which cannot be empirically demonstrated. And on the truth of these principles which cannot be empirically demonstrated rests the entire superstructure of all man's empirical knowledge. To this the followers of Kant seem to be totally blind. And Kant himself, while he fully understood it, in his insane attempt to give the world a new species of metaphysic, resolutely ignored it, and fell into the glaring absurdity of accepting all this as truth, though it is independent of experience and at the same time rejecting the existence of God because we cannot bring this existence into experience. It is not a little surprising, too, that this feature of Kant's absurd, inconsistent, illogical and contradictory philosophy has hitherto escaped the critics. Yet there is no denying it. And its exposition is all that is necessary to overthrow the entire Kantian contention regarding the proofs for the existence of God.

But one absurdity leads inevitably to another, and in order to give color to his claim against logical necessity, Kant sinks deeper into the mire, coolly undertaking to maintain that the universal proposition that every effect must have a cause is not universal at all, and that even here the principle of causality is not efficacious, and, consequently, we have the greatest of all effects—the world without any cause. In other words, he tells us that the principle of causality is valid only for experience and has no place or meaning outside experience. Now, it must not be supposed that Kant regards this world as self-existent. By no means. He regards the world as an effect, but denies existence to the cause of this effect. Hence the world must be an effect without a cause. Again, it is to be remarked that he does not advance any argument in proof of this preposterous statement, beyond the general one in which he endeavors to maintain that all his categories (cause and effect among them) have no validity outside of experience, and treatment of this argument must be postponed until we deal with the categories directly. Here, then, we have to deal only with the conclusion not with the argument for it—that the principle of causality is valid only for experience and has no efficacy outside of it. As has already been quoted, Kant tells us:

"If we were thinking only of the form of the world, the manner of its composition and its change, and tried to infer from this cause totally different from the world, this would be again a judgment of the speculative reason only; because the object here is not an object of any possible experience. In this case the principle of causality, which is valid within the field of experience only and utterly useless, nay, meaningless, outside it, would be totally diverted from its proper destination." And still more emphatically he says:

"From something that happens (the empirically contingent) as an effect, to infer a cause, is a principle of natural, though not of speculative knowledge. For if we no longer use it as a principle involving the condition of possible experience and, leaving out everything that is empirical, try to apply it to the contingent in general, there does not remain the smallest justification of such a synthetical proposition, showing how from something which is there can be a transition to something totally different, which we call cause; nay, in such purely speculative application the concepts both of cause and of the contingent lose all meaning, the objective reality of which would be made intelligible in the concrete."

There are two objections interwoven here by Kant with much ingenuity; one that is merely intimated, viz., that we cannot grasp the contingent, for the entire contingent cannot be the object of empirical knowledge, and the other that the principle of causality has no validity except in experience. As Kant nowhere develops the first, it may be passed over, and we shall deal only with the second.

Now, it may be said at the very outset here that it is perfectly true that we cannot verify the statement that the principle of causality is true outside of experience, for the simple reason that we cannot go outside experience to demonstrate it. We cannot outstrip our senses and we cannot transcend experience, whether internal or external. By the very nature of the terms this is impossible, for wherever the individual goes he manufactures experience; consequently, we can never transcend experience. It is true, then, that we cannot by actual demonstration show that the principle of causality is valid outside of experience. But to build any kind of an argument on this inability is to cavil on the tenth part of a hair. The argument carries with it about as much weight as if we were to argue that in the twenty-fifth century the principle of causality would be without objective validity, but not one whit more. We cannot either reach outside of experience or reach forward to the twenty-fifth century to bring forth proof to the contrary. And if any one were to object that, since the principle of causality has objective validity in the twentieth century, we may consequently rest assured that it will be valid also in the twentyfifth; in like manner it could be retorted that, since the principle of causality is valid in experience, we may rest assured that it has validity outside experience also and throughout the whole realm of truth. The snap-game species of argument may be useful in politics, but it is wholly out of place in philosophy. And this is what Kant uses here. This of itself would be a sufficient answer to Kant on this point; but let us examine the matter further.

Whence does the principle of causality derive its character of apodictic certainty? Certainly not from experience. It is wholly independent of all experience, and according to Kant is one of the categories or concepts that make experience possible. Since, then, instead of being dependent on experience, it is wholly independent of experience, both in its origin and nature—so much so, indeed, that experience is largely dependent upon it—how can it be claimed with even the faintest shadow of plausibility that the principle is valid only in experience? Consequently, since it is wholly independent of experience and derives nothing therefrom, the only legitimate conclusion is that it is an illumination of the mind by special knowledge, which it receives-not from experience-but from the realm of universal truth. This truth and knowledge man possesses he knows not how; but one thing is certain, that it is wholly independent of experience. Consequently, the only conclusion that is at all legitimate in the premises is that the principle of causality has universal validity everywhere the empire of truth extends; and this conclusion must stand until shaken by its disproof.

Are we to believe that there is a realm where we can have effects without causes? Shall we say that the principle of causality is true in experience and false outside experience?

But the real meaning of the objection, when followed to its lair, lies in the fact that, being outside experience, we cannot prove that the principle of causality has validity there. In other words, we cannot verify it. Indeed, this is the real kernel in all the objections of this nature against the supernatural. But there are few objections so baseless or senseless. For, first of all, it may be replied that while we cannot bring forward any verification of the validity of cause outside experience, neither can Kant or his followers bring forward anything like disproof of its validity. The one is as impossible of verification as the other. The whole argument of Kant rests on mere assertion. But what Kant seems to have overlooked completely here is that such a method of arguing is simply undermining all certainty, and he will soon discover that if on these flimsy pretexts he questions the validity of cause and effect outside of experience, he must soon be prepared to defend its validity in experience. For having opened the doors to doubt in the matter, the doubt will soon enter everywhere. If verification be always demanded as the test of the truth of a logical necessity, we shall soon be obliged to drop much of our vaunted knowledge within experience. A thoroughgoing skeptic armed with this principle of verification would soon make havoc with whole provinces of our boasted speculative and even practical knowledge. The whole future—even to-morrow—is outside experience, and no one can say with certainty that the sun will rise to-morrow. It is beyond verification. Nor will it do to claim that past experience must be our guide. For if we begin to question the value of the primary principles of reason because they cannot in certain cases be verified, our thoroughgoing skeptic may justly tell us our past experience can be no guide for the future, inasmuch as we have only the past as a teacher. He may tell us that the past—even of all human experience—is but a small section of experience, and the future of experience may reverse the whole experience of the past. He may tell us there may be periods of progression and periods of regression, of evolution and involution, and that during the periods of regression and involution all past experience may be reversed. Should he thus argue and tell us that even to-morrow the law of inversion should begin and our past experience would be worthless, Kant and his followers must remain dumb, since they cannot verify the validity of their principles in the future. But such a skeptic would be quite as fully justified in denying the validity of the principle of causality in the thirtieth century as Kant is in questioning its validity outside experience as he calls it. Kant is, therefore, handling a two-edged sword and is at the same time quarrying beneath the foundations of all certainty when he questions the universal validity of cause and effect throughout the whole realm of truth.

But the real fact is that, even were Kant's contention true which it is not—that the principle of causality has no validity outside experience, it would not help him here at all. For in the proof of the existence of a cause for the contingent we are not using the principle outside of experience, but wholly within experience. Kant is forced to admit the principle that everything in experience must have a cause and that, at least in experience, the principle of causality is operative and even necessary. Every effect in experience must have a cause; but the contingent is wholly and entirely within experience, and it is this effect-in experience, and not outside it—for which the cause is demanded. Consequently, according to Kant's own principle that the principle of causality is valid and necessary in experience, though invalid outside of it, the existence of the cause for the contingent is imperatively necessary. Consequently, it is only a brazen assumption to say that, when we are applying the principle of causality to the world, we are using it outside experience. Shall we admit, then, with Kant that cause and effect have no application here? Then we have the greatest of all effects in experience without a cause and the principle of causality failing in the realm of experience itself. The recklessness of Kant's reasoning in this sphere is absolutely senseless and opposed to all the laws of reason. At the same time, Kant was shrewd enough to perceive this objection and its overwhelming force against his reckless and insane statements. He, however, took particular pains not even to hint at it. But in his own astute fashion he tried to meet it without vouchsafing it even the slightest recognition. For it was doubtless this objection Kant had in mind and which he wished to forestall when he invented the ridiculous plea mentioned in the early part of this article—that the whole of the contingent—since we cannot grasp it as such—is a transcendental idea and consequently does not belong to experience. evidently wished by this absurd plea to place not only the cause, but the contingent itself, outside experience, and thus by his ingenious fiction place both the contingent and its cause outside the province of the principle of causality, which he maintains is valid only for experience. Removing both outside experience, they become, of course, unapproachable by the principle of cause and effect. As Kant, however, does not elaborate the process by which he places the contingent among the transcendentals (!) we need

not follow up this point here. The direct answer, then, to Kant's assertion that the principle of causality has no validity outside experience is, first, that Kant cannot know whether or no this is a fact; secondly, that the principle itself is wholly independent of experience and derives not one single iota of its validity from experience, although it helps to interpret experience for us, and that since its validity is drawn not from experience, but from we know not whence, its validity must be conceded independent of experience, and consequently outside of experience; thirdly, that such is its validity independent of experience, that it is absolutely necessary in order to give a meaning to much of experience, and a large portion of experience would be meaningless without it; hence the validity which it brings with it into experience and which gives meaning to so much of experience must have been obtained outside experience, and therefore it is valid there; and fourthly, whether or no it is valid outside of experience is of little consequence here; for the problem to be solved—the cause of the existence of the contingent—is not outside experience at all, but very much in experience, since it is the sum total of all experience for which we are seeking the cause. And if we deny that the principle of causality has validity in this solution, we have the anomaly of the sum total of all effects without any cause at all, or to use Kant's own words, beneath the contingent "the foundation sinks, unless it rests upon the immovable rock of that which is absolutely necessary, and this itself hangs without a support if without and beneath it there be empty space and everything be not filled by it, so that no room be left for a why—in fact, if it be not infinite in reality."

But after the tragedy comes the farce. Kant having excluded the Supreme Being from all claims to existence, from all claim to recognition by reason, from the realm of causality, from all claim to consideration as the first great and necessary cause of all things in a word, having excluded it from the realm of logical conclusion altogether and having shown—as he thinks—the impossibility of admitting the existence of God as the first cause or otherwise, proceeds to tell us-risum teneatis-that, nevertheless, though God does not exist, we must make believe that He does, for otherwise all our knowledge becomes nonsense without meaning of any kind. In other words, Kant finds himself compelled to bring back this selfsame Supreme Being and install it exactly in the place from which he so summarily excluded it. What is more, he cannot make one single step in empirical knowledge until he does this. Reason herself compels him to restore this highest reality to the throne from which he has expelled it. Perhaps no other philosopher before or after Kant ever gave expression to absurdity equal to that in which he tells us that, although we must deny existence to the Supreme Being, reason compels us to pretend that this Being exists and that we are forced by reason to consider all things "as if" they had sprung from this Supreme Being. This will seem so incredible that we must quote Kant himself. Attempting to explain that the idea of the Supreme Being has no objective reality, he says:

"The idea . . . means no more than that reason requires us to consider all connection in the world according to the principle of a systematical unity, and, therefore, as if the whole of it had sprung from a single all-embracing Being, as its highest and all-sufficient cause."

That is, while Kant rejects all proofs for the existence of this "all-embracing" and "all-sufficient" reality or Being and will not admit of its existence at any cost, he is forced to the absurd statement that, nevertheless, "reason requires us to consider all connection in the world . . . as if the whole of it had sprung from this single all-embracing Being." And again Kant tells us:

"Thus I say that the concept of a highest intelligence is a mere idea, that is, that its objective validity is not to consist in its referring directly to any object (for in that case we should not be able to justify its objective validity); but that it is only a schema, arranged according to the conditions of the highest unity of reason, of the concept of a thing in general, serving only to obtain the greatest systematical unity in the empirical use of reason, by helping us, as it were, to deduce the object of experience from the imagined object of that idea as its ground or cause. Thus we are led to say, for instance, that the things of the world must be considered as if (italics Kant's own) they owed their existence to some supreme intelligence."

And again:

"The supposition, therefore, which reason makes of a Supreme Being as the highest cause is relative only, devised for the sake of the systematical unity in the world of sense and a mere something in the idea, while we have no concept of what it may be by itself. Thus we are able to understand why we require the idea of an original Being, necessary by itself, with reference to all that is given to the senses as existing, but can never have the slightest conception of it and of its absolute necessity."

And again he tells us:

"This Being, demanded by reason (ens rationis ratiocinatæ), is no doubt a mere idea, and not therefore received as something absolutely real and real by itself. It is only admitted problematically . . . in order to enable us to look upon the connection

of things in the world of sense, as if they had their ground in that Being, the real object being to found upon it that systematical unity which is indispensable to reason, helpful in every way to the empirical knowledge of the understanding and never a hindrance to it."

And again:

"We ought not to derive the order and systematical unity of the world from a supreme intelligence, but borrow from the idea of a supremely wise cause the rule according to which reason may best be used for her own satisfaction in the connection of causes and effects in the world."

Here, then, although we are not allowed to assert the existence of a Supreme Being, we are nevertheless told that we must suppose the existence of such a Being and reason as if such a Being existed; that reason requires this supposition; that all our reasoning must proceed according to this supposition; that reason requires this idea of an original Being; and since Kant arbitrarily refuses to let reason have the reality, reason must make believe that it is in possession of this reality and proceed as if the Supreme Being really existed. Nay, this method of cheating itself into false beliefs Kant calls a maxim of reason, a rule of reason, and he establishes it as a "regulative principle" to guide reason in her search after knowledge. Now, this notion is so preposterous that it seems to be an offspring of bedlam; vet Kant devotes pages to its development. He denies existence to the Supreme Being when it is demanded by a logical necessity and maintains that this logical necessity of a Supreme Being is without objective reality; and then he tells us that the requirements of reason are such that we must always pretend that this Being, to which he has denied existence, does really exist. He tells us that unless we thus prevaricate we can have no knowledge of things at all; that unless we lie to ourselves and make believe that a Supreme Being exists where it does not, we can never have that systematical unity of knowledge which reason requires and without which it will not rest satisfied. And reason requires not merely the notion or the idea, but it must believe as true that this Supreme Being exists, and so imperative is it upon this point that Kant is forced to humor reason, to deceive it, to impose a false belief upon it, to foist upon it a supposition for a reality, and make it believe that the reality is actually there when it is not. In everything else reason seems to be quite a respectable faculty on which implicit reliance may be placed; here, however, she is a wilful dame and will have her way at any cost even if she has to lie in the attainment of her ends. And she is not only wilful and illogical, but extremely whimsical. She will

not, if we are to believe Kant, accept the existence of the Supreme Being which the laws of logical necessity—backed by the principle of causality-force upon her. This existence, according to Kant, is rejected as false. But while she rejects this as false, she invents a fiction of her own which, Kant admits, has no existence of any kind and declares that this is precisely what she wanted from the outset; and so she makes pretense of believing—both to herself and others -that the pretended Being has actual existence. And why does reason act in this capricious manner? Kant tells us reason requires this existence for the systematical unity of her ideas. Without systematical unity in her ideas reason is like a spoiled child and cries until she gets it; and so Kant is forced to give her the stuffed baby of existence and pretend to her it is reality, and her tears cease at once. She is satisfied wholly with this counterfeit existence of the Supreme Being. And this counterfeit existence of a Supreme Being which Kant finds necessary to appease reason, after he has torn from her the genuine reality, Kant calls a regulative principle of reason.

And here Kant's philosophy rests. On this falsehood as a foundation reason rests the unity of all her knowledge. Without this counterfeit we can have no systematical unity of truth or knowledge at all; but this falsehood once established, all knowledge is at once regulated, falls into perfect order and becomes systematic enough to meet all—even the most fastidious—demands of reason. This regulative principle sets all things to rights. And with this absurdity as the final word of philosophy Kant seems perfectly content to rest. He started out to probe reason to the very core—to find out her last word on human knowledge and its possibility—to find a therefore for every wherefore; and this is the grand anticlimax of all. According to Kant, then, all the clocks of empirical truth are regulated by a falsehood, and without this fundamental falsehood we can have no unity of truth at all.

"We have not the slightest ground to admit absolutely," he tells us, "the object of that idea (the Supreme Being), for what could enable or even justify us in believing or asserting a Being of the highest perfection and absolutely necessary from its very nature on the strength of its concept only, except the world with reference to which alone such an hypothesis may be called necessary? We then perceive that the idea of it, like all speculative ideas, means no more than that reason requires us to consider all connection in the world according to the principles of a systematical unity, and, therefore, as if the whole of it had sprung from a single all-embracing Being as its highest and all-sufficient cause."

But why should reason require a falsehood? If there be no

such existence, why does reason cry like a spoiled child until we admit there is? Why does reason require a lie as the basis of all empirical truth? Why does she-wilful jade that she is-insist upon a great philosopher like Kant making himself and all knowledge ridiculous? These are questions which do not seem to have occurred to Kant at all. He seems to rest perfectly satisfied with his discovery of a counterfeit truth as the basis on which rests all our empirical knowledge. And thus, instead of resting philosophy on a solid foundation, we find it hanging in midair. Kant started out to give us the key to reason and all her processes and workings. He wishes to reduce all knowledge to a mere knowledge of the senses, and here is where he lands us. It would be difficult to find anything more superficial or more irrational than this regulative principle of Kant, whose colossal absurdity seems to have been overlooked by Kant's critics. This regulative principle fills too large a space in Kant's system, however, to be dismissed with a few remarks at the end of an article, and we may return to it some day. Meanwhile—and it is the reason of introducing it here—we have seen that while Kant haughtily rejects the existence of the Supreme Being as a reality, he is forced to suppose it as a mere fiction and to proceed in all his reasoning as if the Supreme Being really existed. for otherwise he can find no systematical unity in all his empirical knowledge and nothing has any meaning. Sensible people will. of course, conclude that there is one explanation of all this, viz., that Kant's rejection of the reality is the source of all his trouble and absurdity; that this rejection is illogical, capricious and ridiculous in the extreme, and that, indirectly, Kant thus gives us one of the very strongest proofs for the existence of God.

So much, then, for Kant's objections to the proofs for the existence of God. We have, however, glanced merely at his general reasons. Some day, too, we may return to his particular arguments. which present a very tempting covey. But to meet Kant with an overwhelming answer to all his superficial—though apparently profound—contention, all this was unnecessary. Even if all that we have said were of no value—and it defies answer, we believe—there would remain one argument in itself sufficient for the complete overthrow of all Kant's sophistry upon this point. It is this: Kant's rejection of the proofs for the existence of God rests, as we have seen, on a twofold foundation: The Supreme Being, he tells us, does not admit of objective reality, and we can never meet with this Supreme Being in experience. Now, is it the workings of the law of retributive justice that makes precisely these two selfsame objections to be absolutely fatal to Kant's philosophy of the "categories?" As Kant expounds these famous concepts they can never

be met with in experience, nor can all the ingenuity of Kant invest them with objective reality. Yet the categories are the very corner-stone of all Kant's metaphysics. These removed, the whole foundation of his philosophy in the "Critique of Pure Reason" is removed. But the elaboration of the proof of this must be reserved for another occasion.

SIMON FITZSIMONS.

Lima, N. Y.

LITTERAE ENCYCLICAE.

Ad Patriarchas Primates Archiepiscopos Episcopos Aliorumque Locorum Ordinarios Pacem et Communionem cum Apostolica Sede Habentes.

PIUS PP. X.

Venerabiles Fratres Salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem.

TAMDUDUM in Lusitania incredibilem quemdam cursum fieri per omnem immanitatem facinorum ad Ecclesiam opprimendam, vobis quidem omnibus, Venerabiles Fratres, satis cognitum arbitramur. Nam, ubi status eius civitatis in formam conversus est reipublicae, continuo coepisse, aliud ex alio, sanciri talia quae inexpiabile religionis catholicae spirent odium, quis ignorat? Violenter pelli de medio vidimus familias religiosorum, atque hos, maximam partem, dure inhumaniterque e Lusitanis exterminari finibus. Vidimus, ob studium pertinax omnem disciplinam civilem profanandi nullumque religiosae rei vestigium in actione vitae communis relinquendi, expungi de numero festorum festos Ecclesiae dies; iuri iurando insitam religionis notam detrahi; festinanter legem de divortiis condi; praeceptionem doctrinae christianae a scholis publicis excludi. Denique, ut alia omittamus quae persegui longum est, vehementius ab his Antistites sacrorum peti. duosque e spectatissimis Episcopis, Portugalliensem et Beiensem, viros cum integritate vitae tum magnis in patriam Ecclesiamque promeritis illustres, de sedibus honoris sui deturbari. Ouum autem novi gubernatores Lusitaniae tot tantaque ederent imperiosae libidinis exempla, scitis quam patienter quam moderate sese adversus eos Apostolica haec Sedes gesserit. Equidem summa diligentia duximus cavendum, ne quidquam ageremus, quod posset contra Rempublicam hostiliter actum videri. Nonnulla enim spe tenebamur fore, ut ii aliquando saniora inirent consilia, ac de iniuriis illatis aliquo tandem pacto Ecclesiae satisfacerent. Verum tota re Nos fefellit animus: ecce nefario operi tamquam fastigium imponunt pessimae ac perniciosissimae promulgatione legis de Civitatis ab Ecclesiae rationibus separandis. Iamvero vulnus tam gravi iuri et dignitati inustum religionis catholicae toleranter ferre ac praeterire silentio haudquaquam apostolici religio officii Nos patitur. Quapropter his vos litteris appellamus, Venerabiles Fratres, universoque nomini christiano omnem huius facti indignitatem denuntiamus.

Principio legem, de qua loquimur, absurdum quiddam esse et monstruosum apparet ex eo, quod rem publicam divini cultus esse expertem statuit, quasi vero non ab Ipso, qui conditor et conservator est rerum omnium, cum homines singuli tum consociatio quaevis hominum et communitas pendeat: item quod catholicae religionis observantia solvit Lusitaniam, eius inquimus religionis, quae huic genti maximo semper praesidio et ornamento fuit, quamque universitas fere civium profitetur. Sed tamen, esto: placuit tantam civitatis Ecclesiaeque coniunctionem, eamque sollemni pactorum fide confirmatam, discindi. Hoc posito discidio, consentaneum profecto erat omittere Ecclesiam et sinere ut communi libertate ac iure uteretur, quo quisque civis et honesta quaeque civium societas utitur. Quod totum contra est. Nam a separatione quidem haec lex nomen habet, re tamen ipsa eam habet vim, ut Ecclesia in externis bonis ad extremum inopiae spoliando redigat, in iis autem quae sunt sacrae potestatis ac spiritus, in servitutem reipublicae opprimendo tradat.

Et primum, quod attinet ad res externas, ita se Lusitana Respublica ab Ecclesia segregat, ut nihil omnino ei relinquat unde tueri decus Domus Dei, sacricolas alere, multiplicia caritatis pietatisque exercere munia possit. Etenim, huius praescripto legis, non soluni quascumque res Ecclesia mobiles immobiles obtinet, ex earum possessione, quamvis optimo iure parta, detruditur; verum etiam quaevis ei potestas adimitur quidquam sibi in posterum acquirendi. Statuitur quidem, ut certa civium corpora divino cultui exercendo praesideant: verum quae his datur facultas ad accipiendum quidquid in eam causam oblatum sit, mirum quam angustis terminis circumscribitur. Praeterea, quibus obligationibus obstricti, cives catholici aliquid vel subsidii vel stipendii suo quisque curioni praestare consueverunt, eas extinguit lex ac perimit, prohibens, ne quid iam eo nomine exigatur. Utique sinit, ut ipsi sumptibus in divinum cultum faciendis catholici homines voluntaria stipis collatione provideant; sed tamen iubet de summa ob eam rem conflata detrahi tertiam partem et in officia beneficentiae civilis insumi. Atque ad haec omnia illud velut cumulus accedit, quod ex hac lege aedificia quae deinceps comparari aut exstrui contingat in usum sacrorum, ea, cum definitus annorum numerus effluxerit, submotis possessoribus legitimis nec iis factis indemnibus, in publicum referentur.

De rebus vero, in quibus sacra Ecclesia potestas proprie versatur, multo est gravius multoque perniciosius ludibrium Separationis huius, quae, uti diximus, ad indignam ipsius Ecclesiae recidit servitutem. Primum omnium, Hierarchia prorsus, tamquam ignorata, negligitur. Si qua de hominibus sacri ordinis mentio fit, ideo fit, ut interdicatur eis, ne ullo se modo ordinationi religiosi cultus immisceant. Omnis ea cura demandata est consociationibus laicorum, quae institutae iam sint, aut futurae sint, beneficentiae causa, et quidem institutae ad normam disciplinae civilis, ex auctoritate Reipublicae, nulla ut ratione ab Ecclesiae potestate pendeant. Quod si de consociatione, cui sit hoc muneris deferendum, clerici cum laicis

dissenserint, aut inter laicos ipsos non convenerit, diiudicanda res relinquitur non Ecclesiae sed arbitrio Reipublicae, quae sola in hisce institutis dominatur. Atque in constituendo divino cultu usque adeo recto res rei Lusitanae non patiuntur locum esse Clero, ut aperte praescriptum et statutum sit, non posse, qui religionis ministeriis sint addicti, aut in decurias parochiarum cooptari aut in partem vocari administrationis vel regiminis consociationum, quas memoravimus: qua quidem praescriptione nihil iniquius aut intolerabilius cogitari potest, cum clericorum ordinem in ea ipsa re, qua praestat, inferiorem, quam ceteros cives, conditione faciat.

Ouibus autem vinculis Lusitana lex constringat et implicet Ecclesiae libertatem, vix credibile est: adeo cum institutis horum temporum atque etiam cum publicis libertatum omnium praeconiis pugnat res: adeo est humano quovis civilique populo indigna. Igitur sanctum est gravibus paenis, ne qua sacrorum antistitum acta mandari typis, ullove pacto, ne intra parietes quidem templorum, proponi populo liceat, nisi concessu Reipublicae. Praeterea interdictum, extra sacrarum aedium limina, ne, inconsulta Republica, caeremoniarum quid celebretur, ne qua pompa circumducatur, ne quis ornamenta sacra neve ipsam vestem talarem gerat. Item vetitum, non modo ad monumenta publica, sed etiam ad aedes privatorum quidquam apponi quod catholicam religionem sapiat; at minime vetitum, quod catholicos offendat. Item societatem coire religionis pietatisque colendae gratiâ, non licet: cuius quidem generis societates eodem plane habentur loco atque illae nefariae, quae scelerum causa conflentur. Ad haec, cum concessum sit omnibus civibus ad suum arbitrium uti posse rebus suis, catholicis tamen contra ius fasque importune coangustatur potestas huiusmodi, si quid de suo attributum velint solandis piorum manibus aut sumptibus divini cultus suppeditandis: et quae id genus pie statuta iam sunt, impie deformata convertuntur in alios usus, violatis testamentis et voluntatibus auctorum. Denique Respublica-id quod maxime est acerbum et grave-non dubitat regnum invadere auctoritatis Ecclesiae, ac plura de ea re praescribere, quae cum ad ipsam sacri ordinis constitutionem spectent praecipuas curas Ecclesiae sibi vindicant: de disciplina dicimus et institutione sacrae iuventutis. Neque enim solum cogit alumnos Cleri, ut doctrinae et litterarum studiis, quae theologiam antecedunt, in lyceis publicis dent operam, ubi ipsorum integritas fidei, ob alienum a Deo Ecclesiaque institutionis genus, praesentissimis sane periculis est obiecta; verum in domesticam etiam Seminariorum vitam temperationemque sese infert Respublica, sibique ius arrogat designandi doctores, probandi libros. sacra Clericorum studia moderandi. Ita vetera in usum revocantur scita Regalistarum; quae quidem molestissimam arrogantiani habuerunt, dum Civitatis Ecclesiaeque concordia stetit, nunc vero, quum Civitas sibi cum Ecclesia nihil iam vult esse, nonne pugnantia et plena insaniae videantur? Quid, quod etiam ad Cleri depravandos mores atque ad incitandam defectionem a praepositis suis hanc apprime factam legem dixeris? Nam et certas pensiones ex aerario assignat iis, qui sint, antistitum auctoritate, a sacris abstinere iussi, et singularibus beneficiis sacerdotes ornat, qui, suorum officiorum misere immemores, ausi fuerint attentare nuptias, et, quod referre piget, eadem beneficia ad participem fructusque, si qui fuerint superstites, sacrilegae coniunctionis extendit.

Postremo parum est quod Ecclesiae Lusitanae, suis despoliatae bonis, servile prope iugum imponit Respublica, nisi etiam nitatur, quantum potest, hinc ipsam e gremio catholicae unitatis deque complexu Ecclesiae Romanae divellere, illinc impedire, quominus religiosis Lusitaniae rebus Apostolica Sedes auctoritatem providentiamque suam adhibeat. Itaque ex hac lege, ne Romani quideni Pontificis iussa pervulgari, nisi concessum sit publice, licet. Pariter sacerdoti, qui apud aliquod athenaeum, Pontificia auctoritate constitutum, academicos in sacris disciplinis gradus consecutus sit, etiam si theologiae spatium domi confecerit, sacris fungi muneribus non licet. In quo planum est, quid velit Respublica: nempe efficere, ut adolescentes clerici, qui perfici sese et perporiri in studiis optimis cupiunt, ne ob eam causam conveniant in hanc urbem, principem catholici nominis; ubi certe proclivius, quam usquam alibi factu est, ut et mentes incorrupta christianae doctrinae veritate, et animi sincera in Apostolicam Sedam pietate ac fide conformentur. Haec, praetermissis aliis, quae quidem non minus habent iniquitatis, haec igitur praecipua sunt improbae huius legis capita.

Itaque, admonente Nos Apostolici conscientià officii ut, in tanta importunitate et audacia inimicorum Dei, dignitatem et decus Religionis vigilantissime tueamur, ac sacro sancta Ecclesiae catholicae iura conservemus, Nos legem de Lusitana Republica Ecclesiaque separandis, quae Deum contemnit, professionemque catholicam repudiat; quae pacta sollemniter conventa inter Lusitaniam et Apostolicam Sedem, ius naturae ac gentium violando, rescindit; quae Ecclesiam de iustissima rerum suarum possessione deturbat; quae ipsam Ecclesiae libertatem opprimit divinamque constitutionem pervertit; quae denique maiestatem Pontificatus Romani, Episcoporum ordinem, Clerum populumque Lusitaniae atque adeo catholicos homines, quotquot sunt orbis terrae, iniuria contumeliaque afficit, pro apostolica auctoritate Nostra improbamus, damnamus, reiicimus. Ouum autem vehementer conquerimur huiusmodi latam, sanctam, propositam in publicum esse legem, sollemnemque cum omnibus, quicumque rei auctores ac participes fuerunt, expostulationem facimus, tum vero quidquid ibi contra inviolata Ecclesiae iura statutum est, nullum atque inane et esse et habendum esse edicimus ac denuntiamus.

Profecto haec difficillima tempora, quibus Lusitania, post indictum publice Religioni bellum, conflictatur, magnam Nobis sollicitudinem tristitiamque efficiunt. Dolemus nimirum tot malorum spectaculo, quae gentem, Nobis penitus dilectam, premunt; angimur exspectatione acerbiorum rerum, quae certe eidem impendent, nisi qui praesunt, mature se ad officium revocarint. Sed vestra Nos eximia virtus, Venerabiles Fratres, qui Lusitanam gubernatis Ecclesiam, Clerique istius ardor vestrae virtuti mirabiliter concinens, valde consolatur, bonamque spem affert, fore istic aliquando res, Deo adiuvante, meliores. Vos enim omnes non sane securitatis rationem aut commodi, sed officii et dignitatis habuistis nuper, cum iniquam discidii legem palam et libere indignando repudiastis; cum una voce professi estis malle vos vestrorum iactura bonorum sacri muneris redimere libertatem, quam pro mercedula pacisci servitutem; cum denique negastis ullo unquam aut astu aut impetu inimicorum posse vestram cum Romano Pontifice coniunctionem labefactari. Ista quidem, quae in conspectu Ecclesiae universae dedistis, fidei, constantiae magnique animi praeclara documenta, sciatis cum voluptati bonis omnibus, tum vobis honori, tum ipsi laboranti Lusitaniae emolumento fuisse non mediocri. Quare pergite, ut instituistis, Religionis causam, quacum salus ipsa communis patriae connexa est, agere proviribus: sed videte in primis, ut et ipsi inter vos, et christianus populus vobiscum, et omnes cum hac Beati Petri Cathedra summam consensionem et concordiam retineatis diligenter et confirmetis. Hoc enim auctoribus nefariae legis propositum est, quod diximus: non a Republica (ut videri volunt) separare Ecclesiam Lusitanam, quam despoliant opprimuntque, sed a Vicario Iesu Christi. Ouod si tali hominum consilio ac sceleri occurere atque obsistere omni vos ope studueritis, iam rebus Lusitaniae catholicae commode per vos consultum fuerit. Nos interea, pro singulari qua vos diligimus caritate, Deo omnipotenti supplices erimus, ut diligentiae studioque vestro bonus faveat. Vos autem rogamus, reliqui orbis catholici Antistites, ut id ipsum officii tam necessario tempore sollicitis e Lusitania fratribus praestare velitis.

Auspicem vero divinorum munerum ac testem benevolentiae Nostrae, vobis omnibus, Venerabiles fratres, et Clero populoque vestro Apostolicam benedictionem peramanter impertimus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum die XXIV. mensis Maii, in festo Dominae Nostrae Mariae, adiutricis christianorum, anno MCMXI., Pontificatus Nostri octavo.

ON THE CHURCH IN PORTUGAL.

ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF HIS HOLINESS PIUS X., BY DIVINE PROVIDENCE, POPE.

TO THE PATRIARCHS, PRIMATES, ARCHBISHOPS, BISHOPS AND OTHER ORDINARIES, IN PEACE AND COMMUNION WITH THE APOSTOLIC SEE.

Venerable Brethren, Health and the Apostolic Benediction.

TTE THINK, venerable brethren, it is well known to you all already that in Portugal the incredible course has been taken of oppressing the Church by all manner of savage deeds. For every one is aware that when the form of government in that State was changed into a Republic there began to be sanctioned, one after another, measures breathing an implacable hatred of the Catholic religion. We have seen the religious communities violently banished and for the most part driven in a harsh and inhuman manner from the confines of Portugal. We have seen that, owing to an obstinate desire of giving a profane character to every civil regulation and of leaving not a trace of religion in public life, the feast days of the Church have been expunged from the number of public holidays; the oath taken in courts of justice deprived of its religious character; a law on divorce passed in haste; the teaching of religious doctrine excluded from the public schools. Finally, passing over other things-for it would take too long to enter fully into the subject—we have seen the Bishops vehemently attacked by the same people and two of the most distinguished of them—the Bishops of Oporto and Beja, men notable for their integrity of life and for their great service to their country and the Church—cast forth from their sees. Although the new rulers of Portugal gave so many and such extraordinary examples of wanton tyranny, you know how patiently and how moderately this Holy See has acted towards them. Indeed, we have taken the greatest care lest anything we might do should be regarded as an act of hostility towards the Republic. We entertained some hope that they would sooner or later adopt sane counsels and by an agreement with the Church give satisfaction for the wrongs which had been done. But we were altogether deceived. They crown their wicked work by the promulgation of the evil and most pernicious law separating Church and State. Our apostolic duty would not permit us by any means to pass over in silence the infliction of such a serious wound on the rights and dignity of the Catholic religion. Wherefore, venerable brethren, we address

you in this letter and we denounce the baseness of these proceedings to the whole Christian world.

That the law of which we speak is something absurd and monstrous is evident in the first place from the fact that it is laid down that the State is not bound to preserve public worship, as if it was not dependent on Him who is the founder and preserver of all things, both of men individually and of every association and community of human beings. It also releases Portugal from the duty of observing Catholic worship, that religion which has always been the greatest support and ornament to the people of Portugal and which nearly all the citizens profess. But let us go on; it pleased the Government to sever such a connection between Church and State, one which was confirmed by solemn pacts. The severance being made, it surely was but right to set free the Church and to allow her the common rights and liberties enjoyed by every citizen and every honorable society of citizens. But quite the contrary has taken place; for although this law is called a law of separation, in reality it is of such a character that it reduces the Church in externals by spoliation to extreme indigence, whilst as regards spiritual matters it places it in servitude and in a state of persecution under the Republic.

And, first of all, as to external affairs, the Republic of Portugal separates itself from the Church in such a way that it leaves her absolutely nothing to provide for the dignity of the house of God, to support the sacred ministers and to discharge the many duties of charity and piety. For by this law not only is the Church deprived of all her possessions, movable and immovable, although justly obtained, but all power of acquiring anything for herself in the future is taken away. It is indeed decreed that corporate bodies of the citizens should have authority over public worship, but it is surprising how narrowly their power of receiving anything offered for that purpose is circumscribed. Moreover, the law removes and does away with the obligation binding Catholic citizens who were accustomed to give anything for the support or salaries of their clergy, forbidding that any demand of that kind should be made. It permits that Catholics should by voluntary collection provide for the expense of divine worship, but it orders that of the sum raised for that purpose a third part must be devoted to works of civil beneficence. To complete the injustice, the buildings which may in future be bought or erected for worship are, after a certain number of years, to be taken away from the legitimate possessors and to be used by the State without any indemnity being made to them.

But in matters which specially concern the sacred province of

the Church, the mockery of this separation is much more serious and more ruinous, being a measure which, as we have said, reduces the Church to an unworthy condition of slavery. First of all, the hierarchy is altogether put aside and ignored. If mention is made of clerics, it is done so in order that they may be forbidden to take any part in the regulations for religious worship. All that duty is entrusted to associations of laymen which have been established or will be established for the purpose of benevolence and established, indeed, according to State discipline on the authority of the Republic, so that they may not in any way depend upon the power of the Church. If clerics are at variance with laymen as to the association that is to discharge that duty, or if there is a disagreement on the point amongst the laymen themselves, the settlement of the matter is left not to the Church, but to the decision of the Republic, which alone rules in these affairs. And in the provision for divine worship no place is left for the priest, as it is openly decreed and laid down that those who are ministers of religion cannot be chosen on the parochial committees, or be associated with the administration, or join in the work of the associations I have mentioned—an arrangement than which nothing could be more unjust or more intolerable, inasmuch as it makes the position of the priest inferior to that of the other citizens in the very matter with which he is specially qualified to deal.

The bonds by which the Portuguese law binds and restricts the liberty of the Church are almost incredible—so much so that the state of affairs is a reproach to the institutions of the present day and to the common ideas of present day public liberties, and is unworthy of any humane and civilized people. For instance, it is decreed under heavy penalties that no communication from the Bishops must be put in type under any circumstances, and that it must not be read to the people, even within the walls of the churches, unless by permission of the Republic. Moreover, it is forbidden, unless authority is obtained from the Republic, to celebrate any ceremony outside the precincts of the sacred buildings, to use pomp at any function, or to wear sacred vestments, or even the cassock itself. It is also forbidden to put up not only on public monuments, but even on the houses of private individuals, anything concerning the Catholic religion; but not at all forbidden to put up what may offend Catholics. Likewise, it is unlawful to form a society for the promotion of religion and piety; such societies being treated in the same way as those vile ones which are formed for the perpetration of crime. Furthermore, whilst all citizens are allowed to do what they like with their own, in the case of the Catholics, contrary to what is right and just, the power

of doing so is inconveniently narrowed if they desire to give anything either for the benefit of the souls of the dead or to make better provision for public worship; and the pious gifts already made for this purpose have been impiously converted to other uses, the testaments and wishes of the givers being violated. In finea thing that is particularly serious and bitter—the Republic does not hesitate to interfere in the province of the Church's authority and to lay down a number of rules regarding a matter which, as it concerns the very formation of the clergy, the Church claims for herself as a subject of particular care, namely, the discipline and teaching of clerical students. Not only does the State compel those students to make the studies in science and literature which precede the theological course in public schools where the integrity of their faith, owing to the fact that the teaching is dissociated from God and the Church, is in the gravest peril, but the Republic interferes also in the domestic life and government of the seminaries, and arrogates to itself the right of appointing the teachers, approving of the books and directing the sacred studies of the clerics. Thus what were known of old as the royal privileges are revived—claims which when there was peace between Church and State, betrayed most irksome arrogance; now that the State wants to have nothing to do with the Church, do they not appear to savor of a spirit of warfare and complete insanity? Nay, would you not say that this law was specially made to corrupt the morals of clerics and to stir them to rebellion against their superiors? For it both assigns certain pensions to those who have been suspended by their Bishops and grants special advantages to those who, wretchedly forgetful of their offices, shall form nuptial unions, and, shameful to relate, it extends the same benefits to the women and children in case any of them survive.

Finally, it was to be expected that the Republic, having despoiled the Portuguese Church of its possessions and having subjected it to an almost servile yoke, would endeavor to wrench it away from Catholic unity and the bosom of the Roman Church, and would prevent the Apostolic See from exercising its authority and its care with regard to religious affairs in Portugal. Accordingly by this law not even the orders of the Roman Pontiff may be published without public permission. In the same way a priest who may have obtained his theological degrees in any college established by Pontifical authority, even if he has made his theological course at home, will not be allowed to officiate. It is clear what the Republic's object is in this, namely, to prevent older clerics who desire to perfect and polish themselves in the highest studies from going to Rome, the centre of Christianity, where certainly more

readily than anywhere else, their minds would be strengthened by the truth of Christian doctrine and their souls by sincere faith and piety towards the Apostolic See. Passing over other things not less iniquitous, these are the principal points in this wicked law.

Wherefore as a sense of our apostolic duty prompts, in view of this insolence and audacity of the enemies of God, that we should vigilantly guard the dignity and honor of religion and preserve the rights of the Holy Catholic Church, we of our apostolic authority reprobate, condemn and reject the law separating Church and State in Portugal which makes no account of God, and repudiates the Catholic creed, which, violating the laws of nature and of nations, breaks covenants solemnly entered into between Portugal and the Apostolic See, which thrusts out the Church from the just possession of her own property, which oppresses the liberty of the Church and perverts her divine constitution, and which, finally, treats with insult and contumely the majesty of the Roman Pontiff, the episcopal order and the clergy and people of Portugal, and even Catholics throughout the whole world. And whilst we complain in the strongest manner that a law of this kind should be passed, sanctioned and brought forward in public and solemnly expostulate with all who have prepared it or taken part in the work, we proclaim and announce that whatsoever it contains contrary to the inviolable rights of the Church is null and void, and is to be so held.

Assuredly these difficult times, in which Portugal after war has been publicly proclaimed against religion is in a state of agitation, bring us great anxiety and sorrow. For we grieve at the sight of so many evils which oppress a people very dear to us; we are troubled by the expectation that something worse will happen unless those who are at the head of affairs come to a sense of duty in time. But, venerable brethren, the eminent virtue shown by you who rule the Church in Portugal and the fervor of the clergy, admirably harmonizing with that virtue, greatly console us and afford the strong hope that with God's help things will improve there sooner or later. For undoubtedly you all were influenced not by thoughts of your own security or convenience, but of duty and of the dignity of your office when lately you openly and freely repudiated with indignation the law of separation; with one voice you declared that you preferred to purchase the liberty of your sacred office by the loss of your property than to suffer slavery for a small payment; when in fine you stated that your union with the Roman Pontiff could never be shaken either by craft or open attack. Be assured that those splendid proofs of faith, constancy and greatness of soul which you gave in the sight of the whole

Church were the source of no small pleasure to all good men, of honor to yourselves and of profit to distressed Portugal. Wherefore, continue, as you have resolved to do, to defend to the best of your strength the cause of religion with which is bound up the salvation of your common country; but see, above all, that both you among yourselves, and the Christian people with you, and all with this See of Blessed Peter earnestly maintain and uphold the closest union and concord. For the design of the authors of this odious law is what we have spoken of-not to separate the Portuguese Church, which they despoiled and oppressed (as they wish to make it appear) from the Republic, but from the Vicar of Jesus Christ. If with all your might you strive to meet and resist such a design and crime on the part of these men you will provide well for the interests of Catholic Portugal. Meanwhile, in accordance with the special love which we bear you, we shall pray to Almighty God to be good enough to favor your earnestness and your zeal.

And you, the prelates of the rest of the Catholic world, we ask that you should discharge the same duty in this time of need on behalf of the troubled brethren in Portugal.

As an augury of divine blessings and a proof of our good will we lovingly impart the apostolic benediction to you all, venerable brethren, and to your clergy and people.

Given at St. Peter's, Rome, on the 24th May, the feast of Our Blessed Lady Help of Christians, in the year 1911, the eighth of our pontificate.

PIUS X., POPE.

Book Reviews

THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA. An International Work of Reference on the Constitution, Doctrine, Discipline and History of the Catholic Church. In fifteen volumes. Vol. XI. New Mex—Phil.

The editors of the Encyclopedia acknowledge that the hearty recognition accorded to the first ten volumes has stimulated them to renewed effort, and that as a result, the present volume may be said to reflect the combined confidence of both critic and collaborator. They also call attention to the uniformity of purpose which the twelve hundred odd contributors have come to feel through a deeper familiarity with the nature of the enterprise, and to the added excellence which it has imparted to the eleventh volume, that renders it still more attractive. They say truthfully that the real test of any standard work of reference is the extent to which bias and prejudice have been eliminated and the disinterested exposition of facts that come within its province. Never for an instant have the editors lost sight of the guiding principles laid down at the outset; never, once, has a subject been treated with any other aim in view than that of furnishing adequate, direct, uncolored and first handed in-As an indication that the zeal and vigor with which the work has been carried on have not in any way been relaxed, they point to an entire new page of qualified contributors. The subjects treated in the present volume seem to present an unusual variety of more than ordinary interest, although if we were to look back we should probably find that we had said the same thing about each of the preceding volumes. It can be said truthfully of each one, for each is a collection of detached papers on subjects of almost universal interest, and in very many cases the information is practically inaccessible in any other form. For this reason, as has been said several times before, each volume has a distinct and immediate value which should urge the reader or student to come into possession of the work as soon as possible. A glance at Volume XI. draws attention to several individual excellencies. For instance, as an illustration of how carefully the editors choose contributors, we notice that Rev. Horace K. Mann, whose great "Lives of the Popes in the Middle Ages" has already reached the eighth volume, contributes several articles on the Popes; that Rev. E. A. D'Alton, whose complete "History of Ireland," in three large volumes, has just been finished, has written on several Irish subjects; and that Rev. Thomas Slater, S. J., whose excellent work on "Moral Theology" in English has attracted widespread attention and commendation, treats several moral subjects.

A striking example of local historical value of the book is found in the histories of the dioceses of the country that are appearing in regular order. In the present volume we have New York, Philadelphia, Ogdensburg and Omaha. Of special interest are Nueva Segovia and Nueva Caceres, in the Philippines, and Panama. We must confess we cannot see why the Diocese of New York should occupy nine pages, with eight illustrations, while but three pages of text, with no illustrations, are devoted to Philadelphia. We do not wish to make comparisons, but we think that they would show that the relative importance of the dioceses calls for different spacing. A splendid illustration of the complete treatment of a subject may be found in Dr. Hanna's very interesting, informing and learned article on "Penance." It could be used without change for a lecture or sermon. One might go on indefinitely quoting, but enough has been said to excite the interest of every earnest Catholic and to induce him to desire the book and to strive to obtain it. The publishers are ready to make terms of the most favorable kind to suit all classes.

HISTORY OF IRELAND from the earliest times to the present day, By Rev. E. A. D'Alton, LL. D., M. R. I. A. In three volumes. Vol. III. From 1782-1908. New York: Benziger Brothers, London; The Gresham Publishing Company.

Now that Father D'Alton's "History of Ireland" has been completed, we recall with interest what Archbishop Healy, of Tuam, a well-known Irish historian, said about the writer and his work when the first volume appeared. On that occasion he wrote:

"Some people may be disposed to ask if there were real need of a new history of Ireland, seeing that there are so many already in the hands of the public. Yet it is difficult, if not impossible, to find a really good history of our country—what might be fairly described as an all-round good history—full, accurate, well written and impartial. If the Rev. Mr. D'Alton has not yet accomplished this task, he has certainly made a praiseworthy beginning. This is the first volume of what is intended to be a three volume work, giving a complete history of Ireland from its remotest origins down to our own time. It is an ambitious task, which cannot be accomplished without much learning, courage and perseverance.

"The first volume of this general history gives evidence that he possesses many of the most essential qualities of an historical writer. His style is easy and limpid; in description, as well as in narration, he is vivid and frequently picturesque; he possesses the critical faculty in a high degree, and holds the scales of historical justice with an even hand. Moreover, he is a painstaking writer in verify-

ing his authorities; he has the great advantage of a good knowledge of the Gaelic tongue, which enables him to consult for himself the original sources of our earlier history, and he has not failed to utilize all the State Papers and other official documents which the nineteenth century has produced in such profusion.

"The time is eminently favorable for such a work as this. The Gaelic revival is still a rising tide, and young Irishmen, and Irishwomen also, are anxiously seeking for authoritative information on the history, the literature, the language and the antiquities of their country. Here they will find a work that will go far to satisfy their requirements in these respects, and we have no doubt that many of them will eagerly avail themselves of the opportunities that it offers."

The complete work more than justifies these words of commendation spoken in the beginning. The learned author lived up to his standard with that constant improvement that comes with earnest zealous effort, and the result is a complete, compact, interesting and trustworthy history of Ireland, which was badly needed and should be widely read.

THE SPIRIT OF ST. FRANCIS DE SALES. By His Friend, Jean Pierre Camus, Bishop of Belley. New and enlarged edition, with a preface by His Grace the Archbishop of Westminster. Translated by J. S. 12mo., pp. 510. Burns & Oates, London. Benziger Brothers, New York.

"The spirit of a saint we may, perhaps, regard as the underlying characteristic which pervades all his thoughts, words and acts. It is the note which sounds throughout the constant persevering harmony which makes the holiness of his life. Circumstances change. He grows from childhood to boyhood; from youth to manhood. His time of preparation is unnoticed by the world until the moment comes when he is called to a public activity which arrests attention. And essentially he remains the same. In private as in public, in intimate conversations as in writings or discourses, in the direction of individual consciences as in the conduct of matters of wide importance, there is a characteristic note which identifies him and marks him off apart even from other heroes of sanctity.

"We owe to a keen and close observer a knowledge of the spirit of St. Francis de Sales for which we cannot be too grateful. Let it be granted that Mgr. Camus had a very prolific imagination; that he had an unconscious tendency to embroider facts; that he read a meaning into words which their speaker had no thought of imparting to them. When all such allowances have been made, we must still admit that he has given to us a picture of the saint which we should be loath to lose; and that his description of what

the saint habitually thought and felt has made Saint Francis de Sales a close personal friend to many to whom otherwise he would have remained a mere chance acquaintance."

Surely this is a book to be grateful for. It is a blessed thing to become intimately acquainted with any saint, and to be able to imbibe his spirit, even in small degree, but he is thrice blest who gets close to St. Francis de Sales. This is made possible now because of the appearance of this fuller work, which takes the place of a brief abridgement, which was all that we had heretofore. It is also made easy because, as the writer of the Preface says:

"The Bishop of Belley, while a devoted admirer, was at the same time a critical observer of his saintly friend. He wanted to know the reason of what he saw, he did not always approve and he was sufficiently indiscreet to put questions which, probably, no one else would have dared to frame. And thus we know more about St. Francis than about any other saint, and we owe real gratitude to his very candid, talkative and outspoken episcopal colleague."

These two volumes of cases appear about the same time, and Father Slater's preface explains so well the purpose of such works, at the same time setting forth his plan, that we shall print it as an introduction. He says:

"Few, if any, of those for whom this book is intended will be disposed to deny the usefulness and necessity of casuistry for the ecclesiastical student and the confessor. If the priest's work in the cure of souls and in the confessional is to be done fruitfully and if disastrous mistakes are to be prevented as far as possible. previous and solid training is absolutely necessary. Mere speculative knowledge is not sufficient to fit the priest for his work. His duty is to guide souls according to the principles of the Catholic faith, and a merely speculative knowledge of those principles will not enable him to perform the task imposed upon him. Nobody supposes that book knowledge alone will fit the judge or doctor for the practical work of the law courts and the sickroom. As little will a knowledge of speculative theology fit the priest for the work that he has to do. He is both a judge and a doctor. Only the cases that he has to decide are often more intricate than those which are heard in the law courts, and the

CASES OF CONSCIENCE for English-Speaking Countries, solved by Rev. Thomas Slater, S. J., St. Beuno's College, St. Asaph. Vol. I. 8vo., pp. 351. New York: Benziger Bros.

THE CASUIST. A Collection of Cases in Moral and Pastoral Theology. Vol. III., with an Index of Subjects of the Entire Series. 8vo., pp. 346. New York: Joseph F. Wagner.

diseases which he is called upon to heal are more difficult to diagnose accurately and to prescribe for than are those of the body. It adds to the difficulty that such practical training for their profession as the judge and the lawyer get is not possible in the case of the priest. The medical student walks the wards of the hospitals and observes how cases of bodily disease are treated by an expert. The judge usually has a long preparatory training in the practice of the law. No such practical training is possible for the young aspirant to the priesthood. The next best thing to actual experience in the cure of souls is to provide him with books such as this, where the principles which he has already learned are applied to concrete cases.

"For many years past my official duties have laid on me the task of providing such practical cases for the students under my care. I have always striven to keep the end steadily in view. The moral principles were supposed to be already known. What was wanted was to train the young student so that he might be able to detect at once what principles were to be applied to a given concrete case and to train his judgment so that he might apply those principles correctly. In this volume I have collected together the greater part of the cases that I have given on the general treatises of Moral Theology, the Commandments of God and the Precepts of the Church. I reserve the others for a second volume. I think the experienced reader will acknowledge that the cases are practical and real, such as are met with in actual life. The questions put after each case are intended to indicate some of the chief principles which have to be applied in the case and the practical solution is given at the end. I have not thought it necessary in this book to give full answers to the questions proposed. They are book questions, and the answers to them may be found for the most part in any of the text-books of Moral Theology. For convenience I have often given a reference to my 'Manual of Moral Theology.' I thought it advisable to keep the cases in Latin, as they were drawn up in that language, but as English is largely used in the conference cases of the clergy, the answers to the questions and the solutions are almost wholly given in English."

Those who are familiar with Father Slater's work on "Moral Theology" need not be told that his cases are clear and practical and that they answer the purpose for which he produces them, namely, to make theory serviceable.

As to the "Casuist," we are glad to be able to repeat all that we said in favor of the previous volumes and to withdraw the adverse criticism which we made when the first volume appeared. At that

time we said that the name of the solver of the case or the source from which it was taken ought to be given. In the present volume that is done. We repeat what we said previously, that the cases are unusually practical and that they really solve difficult questions that are arising now in our very midst. A glance at a few of them will make this clear. For instance, several cases on the various phases of the New Marriage Law, the question of assisting at Spiritual Seances, the question of the marriage of a Roman Catholic and an Oriental Schismatic, the question of Sanatio in Radice, the Use of the Stomach-pump before and after Holy Communion, the Burial of Suicides. These are a few examples which show clearly that the book has real, practical, immediate value.

HISTORY OF DOGMAS. By J. Tixeront. Translated from the fifth French edition by H. L. B. Vol. I. The Antenicene Theology. 12mo., pp. 437. St. Louis: B. Herder. 1910.

"This volume is the first of a History of Dogmas in Ancient Theology, which at first was intended to be complete in one volume; its importance, however, is so great, and the material for its composition so abundant, as to have obliged me to divide it into two parts. The eagerness with which this first volume has been called for has decided me not to delay the printing of it until the second is ready. Besides, it treats of a well-defined epoch and, strictly speaking, constitutes by itself an independent whole.

"The method adopted in its composition is the method which, later on, I call synthetic, viz.: I have generally followed the chronological order, setting forth at the same time all the doctrine of each author or document, and following up, so to speak, the history of all the dogmas. Any other method was scarcely practical, because of the character of the epoch to be described: an epoch when great controversies had not yet arisen and strictly socalled definitions on the part of the Church had not yet been made. I am fully aware that such a method may put theologians to some inconvenience; for, while they are anxious to have, grouped together, all the texts referring to a certain subject, in the present work they are obliged, in order to find those texts, to go through the whole book. But although such an inconvenience can scarcely be avoided, I have tried to remove it, as much as I could, by placing at the end of the volume an analytical table by means of which it will be easy to make out, in a short time, the series of testimonies and teachings of the first three centuries on this or that point of doctrine.

"Notes, placed at the beginning of chapters or paragraphs, give

lists of the principal works referring to the author or subject in question; which lists it will be easy to complete by consulting U. Chevalier's 'Repertoire des Sources Historiques du Moyen Age, Bio-bibliographie,' a second edition of which is now being published, and O. Bardenhewer's 'Geschicte der Altkirchlichen Litteratur.'"

The author has carried out his plan faithfully, clearly and learnedly. The result is an interesting and valuable book, which all readers will desire to see completed soon.

ESSAYS. By Rev. Henry Ignatius Dudley Ryder. Edited by Francis Bacchus, of the Oratory, Birmingham. With a frontispiece. 8vo., pp. 322. London and New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

The personality of the author arrests the attention of the reader before he turns to the essays in this volume. His name is known to the largest number, probably by his answers to Littledale's "Plain Reasons Against Joining the Church of Rome." But that book, excellent though it is, does not indicate the strength of Father Ryder's mind and character, because Littledale was not an antagonist worthy of a great mind, nor were his "Plain Reasons" of sufficient weight to call forth the full power of an able man.

Father Ryder was an exceptional man. He was born in what might be called the later transition period in English ecclesiastical history, on the 3d of January, 1837. His father, George Dudley Ryder, was at that time a clergyman of the Church of England. His grandfather, Bishop Ryder, was the first evangelical to be promoted to the episcopate. Newman held him in great veneration.

Father Ryder's mother was a Miss Sargent, whose two sisters married Bishop Wilberforce and Dr. Manning respectively, the latter afterwards Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster.

Father Ryder's childhood was passed at his father's rectory at Easton, near Winchester. While he was yet a young boy his father resigned his living and made his submission to the Catholic Church. Father Ryder's life-long connection with Newman and the Oratory began as a private pupil, when he was about twelve years old. When he was nearly eighteen he wished to become a member of the Birmingham Oratory, but by his father's advice postponed action, and in the meantime spent a year at the English College in Rome and some months at the Catholic University in Dublin, of which Newman was Rector. In December, 1856, he began his Oratorian novitiate, and in 1863 he was ordained priest. He died October 7, 1907, the last survivor of those whose names are recorded at the end of the "Apologia." From boyhood he was in-

timately associated with Cardinal Newman, and succeeded him as Superior of the Oratorians.

Like many other able men, Father Ryder did not write much for publication. Of the ten essays in this volume eight have already appeared in other publications. The subjects treated are: "Spee, a Jesuit Reformer and Poet," "Revelations of the After-World," "Savonarola," "M. Emery, Superior of St. Sulpice," "Auricular Confession," "The Pope and the Anglican Archbishops," "Ritualism, Roman Catholicism and Converts," "On Certain Ecclesiastical Miracles," "The Ethics of War," "The Passion of the Past," "Some Memories of a Prison Chaplain," "Purcell's Life of Manning."

They are all excellent and tempt us to wish for more, but the two not previously published, namely, "Auricular Confession," written in 1899, and "Purcell's Life of Manning," written in 1896, merit special attention. In the former, after answering some attacks on the practice and answering some objections to it, he treats the subject historically, devoting special attention to our own Dr. Lea on the same subject. The last essay is the most interesting of all. Father Ryder was the pupil, the companion, the life-long friend and admirer of Cardinal Newman. But he was also the nephew of Cardinal Manning with all the love and loyalty that such a nephew should have for such an uncle. Surely no one could be found more able or better fitted to discuss Purcell's bungling. Cardinal Vaughan thought so, and hence invited Father Ryder to review "Manning's Life" for the "Dublin Review." He could not be tempted to depart from the fixed habit of reticence which he had always maintained in regard to the estrangement between Newman and Manning. He did, however, communicate his thoughts to a few intimate friends, who induced him to write them down. and the public is permitted to see them now for the first time. The universal verdict will be that it is a pity they did not appear sooner.

We have here a very full treatise and collection of instructions on Prayer and the Virtues and Vices. The first volume treats of Prayer in General, the Lord's Prayer, taking up each petition in turn and the Hail Mary.

The second volume treats of Faith, Hope and Charity, Sin, the Capital Sins in turn and the Beatitudes.

A COMPENDIUM OF CATECHETICAL INSTRUCTION. Edited by Rev. John Hagan, Vice Rector, Irish College, Rome. Two volumes. 8vo., pp. 527. Vol. I., On Prayer; Vol. II., On the Virtues and Vices. New York: Benziger Brothers.

This is the manner of treatment: First, the Roman Catechism is quoted in full, then follows the text of the Catechism of Pius X. and then several instructions by Raineri. The extent of the treatment may be learned by looking at the first chapter on Prayer in General. Here we have twenty pages from the Roman Catechism, two pages from the Catechism of Pius X. and four instructions by Raineri covering twenty-nine pages. This makes fifty-three pages altogether devoted to Prayer in General. A better book of the kind could not be made. The Roman Catechism is a foundation that will last for all time, the Catechism of the present Holy Father, who has done so much to impress the importance of the study of the Catechism on the whole world, has a present special value that can hardly be exaggerated, and it may with equal truth be said that the instructions of Raineri cannot be surpassed for clearness, completeness and unction. If this book were read in Catholic families, a rapid growth in holiness would surely follow. If it were preached in Catholic pulpits, large, wakeful congregations would attend, and many conversions would be made.

LANDS OF THE SOUTHERN CROSS: A visit to South America. By Rev. Charles Warren Currier, Ph. D., Washington, D. C. Spanish-American Publication Society. 12mo., cloth bound, pp. 400. About fifty illustrations.

The author writes from personal observation and study. He has recently returned from a voyage, almost around the South American continent, having represented the United States at the International Congress of Americanists at Buenos Aires, which was part of the programme of the Argentine centennial celebration of the anniversary of its independence.

The book deals with Brazil, Uruguay, Argentina, Chile, Peru, Colombia, Panama and the West Indies from many standpoints, and, incidentally, with Paraguay and Bolivia. The history, literature, inhabitants, buildings, manners and customs, as well as resources, industry and commerce of the various countries, all receive their share of attention. The author furnishes, moreover, many a practical hint to the traveler contemplating a journey to the Southern hemisphere.

He carries the reader with him along the greater portion of the Atlantic coast of South America, tarries for some time in the wonderful capital of the Argentine Republic and crosses the sublime Argentine-Chilean Cordilleras, passing through the newly constructed tunnel, 12,000 feet high. On the Pacific coast the old Spanish civilization is studied, together with the wonders of the Land of

the Incas. The return journey is made through the Canal Zone on the Isthmus and along some untrodden paths in the West Indies.

The work under consideration is a welcome addition to the general literature of South America, which, though increasing, is still scanty.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS IN THE ANCIENT CHURCH. A Study in the History of Dogma. By Dr. J. P. Kirsch, Professor of Patrology and Christian Archæology in the University of Freiburg (Switzerland). Translated with the author's permission by John R. McKee, of the Oratory. 12mo., pp. 272. St. Louis: B. Herder.

"The treatise on the Communion of Saints now presented to the reader in an English translation, although written some ten years ago, seems singularly useful at the present time. In such works as 'Les saints successeurs des dieux," by M. P. Saintyves, and M. Solomon Reinach's "Orpheus," the attempt is made to trace the beliefs and practices connected with this article of the creed to a pagan origin. The best answer to this attack on an integral portion of the Catholic creed is to be found in the representation of the facts as they present themselves to a frank and intelligent investigator such as Professor Kirsch. His treatise is so simple in construction and so plain in its conclusion that any description of its method and contents is superfluous. In the face of the assertions made by the writers named above, it is surely desirable that all, both Catholics and non-Catholics, should have placed before them so excellent a restatement of the Church's faith concerning the Communion of Saints as Dr. Kirsch has here given us."

It is a hopeful sign that this doctrine is attracting more attention even in the Protestant world, is beginning to be better understood and more widely practiced and that the saints are gradually coming to possess the kingdom from which they seemed all but entirely banished in the sixteenth century.

CHARACTER-GLIMPSES OF MOST REV. WILLIAM HENRY ELDER, D. D., Second Archishop of Cincinnati, 12mo., pp. 181. Illustrated. New York: Pustet & Co.

Cardinal Gibbons' epigraph at the beginning of this volume would be sufficient justification for its publication, even if we did not know anything more of the subject. His Eminence says: "Archbishop Elder was the glory of the Priesthood and the ornament of the Episcopate which he adorned for nearly fifty years by his apostolic life." The book itself is made up almost entirely

of correspondence, but of such a varied nature and so well chosen as to give an excellent picture of the boy and man and indisputable proof of his real goodness. The first was written by him to his younger brother Charles, when the writer was thirteen years old and a student at Mount St. Mary's College in 1832. The last was a reply to some inquiries of a Protestant clergyman, dated September 2, 1904. The whole collection, written to persons of different ages and stations of life, in time of sorrow, joy or doubt, discussing questions of faith, morality, doctrine and political economy, furnishes a valuable contribution to American ecclesiastical biography and gives splendid examples of epistolary literature, well worthy of imitation.

The editor, who remains hidden, is to be heartily congratulated on the success of the work.

THE LIVES OF THE POPES IN THE MIDDLE AGES. By Rev. Horace K. Mann. Vol. VII., 1073-1099. Vol. VIII., 1099-1133. St. Louis: B. Herder.

It is most gratifying to the Catholic reviewer to be able to announce two such admirable books on the Papacy as this and Pastor's history by two such sterling and competent historians and covering so many full years. They treat of two very important periods, and supplementing each other as they do, they place before us a wealth of Catholic truth that is abundant and an array of facts that are irresistible. It is only a comparatively short time since we were dependent almost entirely on Protestant authors for this history. Some of them were blindly prejudiced and incompetent and unscrupulous; others were earnest, studious and truthful, as far as their circumstances would permit; but none of them could write true Catholic history in the full sense, because only a Catholic can see things from the Catholic point of view, and that is essential to truth. Dr. Mann's work is making remarkable progress, and he is bringing to the making of each volume that same enthusiasm, learning, zeal and courage which marked him in the beginning as the man for the work. It is a most valuable acquisition to Catholic history.

This is an important work on a very interesting subject, and it will attract widespread attention. The author gives every evidence

THE DAWN OF MODERN ENGLAND. Being a History of the Reformation in England. 1509-1525. By Carlos B. Lumsden, Barrister-at-Law. 12mo., pp. 303. New York and London: Longmans, Green & Co.

of the scholarly, zealous and fair historian who earnestly seeks for the truth, and his assurance that his work is the result of several years of toil was hardly necessary. It is his intention to continue the work down to the execution of Charles I. in 1649, and his, of course, will require many more volumes. Those who examine this volume will wish him health and life to continue.

PERIODICAL

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

DOES NOT CIRCULATE

